

The School Question in Saskatchewan

Addresses Delivered in the Saskatchewan
Legislature During the Session
of 1928-29

by

Hon. J. G. Gardiner

Hon. J. M. Uhrich

Hon. T. C. Davis



Published by authority of the Saskatchewan
Liberal Association

Printed by

The Leader Publishing Co., Limited
Regina, Sask.

Shortt
LC
H4
.S2G22

Shatt

L C

114

-S₂ G₂₂

The School Question in Saskatchewan

Addresses Delivered in the Saskatchewan
Legislature During the Session
of 1928-29

by

Hon. J. G. Gardiner
Hon. J. M. Uhrich
Hon. T. C. Davis



Published by authority of the Saskatchewan
Liberal Association

Printed by
The Leader Publishing Co., Limited
Regina, Sask.



AUG 03 1970

484028

FOREWORD

The British North America Act makes provision for a system of minority as well as public schools and because of this fact agitation has arisen at different periods in Canada's sixty odd years of nationhood over questions arising out of this dual schools system.

It is an historic fact, not disputed by anybody, that Confederation was made possible only because this schools compromise was reached and incorporated in the constitution of the Dominion. Failing such agreement there would have been no Confederation.

Notwithstanding this, extremists on both sides of the question have sought to use it for personal, partizan and even ignoble ends, and have not hesitated to inflame public opinion, especially at election times, through unworthy appeals to racial prejudices and religious passions.

The political history of Canada demonstrates that such campaigns have always failed to realize their objective, the sober commonsense and true patriotism of the Canadian people rejecting such appeals and inflicting defeat upon those responsible for making them. This was particularly the case in Ontario where the Mowat Government was triumphantly returned in election after election in the face of the most bitter attacks based on the so-called School Question.

Upon the establishment of the new Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan the same style of campaign was waged against their Governments, and met like failure.

Then for several Legislative terms the Opposition dropped the School Question, until a few years ago when, following the accession of Dr. J. T. M. Anderson to the leadership of the Conservative party in Saskatchewan, the old discarded and discredited tactics were revived in the absence of any real ground of complaint against the Liberal Government in this Province.

Hence, once again, the plain business issues and policies upon which the electorate should concentrate their thought in deciding a general Provincial election are being beclouded, and there is a Tory revival of appeals to passion and prejudice based on racial descent and religious creeds. Misrepresentation of facts, exaggeration of statements, violence in language employed, inevitably characterize such a campaign, leaving in their wake feelings of suspicion, ill-will, discord, and dis-union, where previously neighbourly sympathy, friendliness, and co-operation had prevailed.

The speeches presented herewith delivered by members of the Gardiner Government, not on the hustings in the heat of an election campaign, but in the Legislative Assembly and upon their responsibility as members and ministers, set forth the policy of the Government in relation to this so-called School Question as disclosed by its official attitude and administrative acts.

Careful reading and thoughtful consideration of these speeches by all Saskatchewan citizens is invited.

HON. J. G. GARDINER

Premier

Address delivered in the Legislature on January 29, 1929, on proposed amendments to The School Act.

Mr. Speaker,—The Bill which is now before the House has been on the Order Paper for some days. I was somewhat surprised when the mover of it (*Mr. Anderson*) gave the few words of explanation which he has given both for the Bill itself and as to his reasons for bringing it into the House. It would have been expected, Mr. Speaker, that, on a Bill which had arisen, as the mover stated, out of discussions which have been taking place in the Province for some months and which, as he stated, was introduced in order to remedy certain conditions that he assumes have existed in our schools during recent months and weeks, he should have taken at least some time to enlighten us as to what those discussions and conditions were.

We can only assume from the remarks which were made, that the reference as to the discussions which have taken place not only outside but inside of the House in connection with previous debates having to do with certain difficulties more or less important,—and to a large extent less important to those who know the situation best,—are with regard to discussions which have arisen over religious differences in a very few districts in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I might state this, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a single school district anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan where a difficulty, such as that referred to a few moments ago by the mover of the Bill, exists at the present moment so far as the Department is aware. We have had some more or less trivial religious difficulties, trivial as compared with many of the other difficulties which have arisen, in connection with affairs having to do with education in this Province. We have had some trivial difficulties in some districts of the Province, but in every case by the usual methods which have been employed ever since this Province was formed and even back in Territorial days before the Province was formed, all those difficulties have been disposed of largely because of the fact that we can depend upon the common sense of the people of this Province to administer, in a proper manner, the affairs of the local school districts just as well as they have administered the affairs of the municipalities, whether those municipalities be rural municipalities or urban municipalities.

I am not going to argue tonight, Mr. Speaker, that at no time do difficulties, religious or otherwise, arise in connection with our schools. Difficulties arise in connection with all the problems which confront school boards, such as settling the disputes that arise between parents and teacher as to which is best capable of controlling the discipline of the school, as to whether the school building should be situated in the centre of the school district or somewhere else and many other difficulties arising largely because of local opinions. Difficulties do arise as to the teaching of religion, or the teaching of languages, or the placing of certain pictures or emblems in the school.

The Practice of the Department

I think I have stated on the floor of the House before, and if I have not, I am going to state it now, that the practice has been followed in all the Provinces of Canada of sending out from the Department of Education from time to time certain pictures which might be put up in the schools. Sometimes we send the pictures of Prime Ministers of Canada, sometimes the pictures of Prime Ministers of the Province. The position I have always taken is this: If the hanging up of the picture of the Prime Minister is going to give offence to any of my Conservative friends, then I would say take the picture down and I would say the same thing as to anything whatsoever, whether it be a crucifix or a picture of King William riding his white horse. Whatever it may be, if it is giving offence to any particular section of the population in a district who are ratepayers and have children attending school, then we have always used our good offices so far as the Department is concerned to see that anything objectionable is removed.

But the question which has been introduced into the House is not such a trivial matter as the leader of the opposition would lead this House to believe, and I venture to state that whether it is passed by the House or turned down by the House, he will not consider it a trivial matter when an appeal to the electorate is made at some future time, whether that time be within this present year or within next year. I venture to state that, whatever action is taken, it will be made the subject of discussion on public platforms in this Province from time to time during the next eighteen months with a view to securing votes for the opposition to this Government. It is important, then, from that point of view that the members of the House, as well as the people of the Province, should understand the question which is confronting them at the present moment because of the introduction of this Bill.

I may ask the question why was the Bill introduced when it was! On at least three or four occasions since this House met, the statement has been made by myself, as Minister of Education, that sooner or later there would be brought down a Bill to amend *The School Act* of this Province. Well, every member of the House knows that the moment a Bill is introduced in the House to amend *The School Act*, any member has the right, no matter on which side of the House he is sitting, to arise in his place in committee and move an amendment to any of the sections of the Act itself.

It was not at all necessary to have introduced into the House a second Bill in order to place before the people of this Province just exactly what the leader of the Opposition had in mind. He could have contented himself in peace for another two minutes, and need not have rushed in immediately the Order was called. Had he contented himself for two minutes there would have been an amendment to *The School Act* before the House and then he could have exercised his right, as a member of the House, in the general discussion in committee, to introduce the amendment to the Bill which he now has before the House. He wished to bring a Bill before the House as a more spectacular gesture toward the end which has been foremost in the mind of certain political strategists.

I remember on one occasion in this House, I think it was during the second Session I had the honour to sit here, in the year 1915, the then leader of the opposition introduced the only Bill that I remember having been introduced into this House from the Opposition side, in the fifteen or sixteen years I have been a member of it. The member who introduced it was the then Leader of the Opposition, now Senator Willoughby. I remember the Minister on this side of the House who had been put in charge of the Department which had to do with that particular legislation and who was somewhat of an authority on English literature, standing up in his place at the seat behind the one I now occupy, and making this statement—I think he was quoting Shakespeare: "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!", and on that occasion the honourable gentleman who occupied the seat behind the one I now occupy said "Oh, that mine enemy would write a Bill!" The honourable gentleman has rushed into the House with this Bill. If I were to make any comment on it with regard to the events of the future, I would say that my prayer was "Oh, that mine enemy would write a Bill!" and the Bill is before us.

Would Increase Number of Separate Schools

I ask you again: Why is this Bill here? My honourable friend has said it does not affect the separate schools in this Province or the rights of minorities, either in relation to religious teaching or language. I am going to submit this, that if this Bill were to become law it would very seriously affect the separate school situation as it exists in this Province. If this Bill were to be made law in the Province in the light of the law as it now stands in connection with the establishment of separate schools, I would predict that within the next three years more separate schools would be established in this Province than have been established from 1905 down to the present time.

The reason for that is very apparent from a mere reading of the Bill now proposed. Let me read the section which is the "active" section of the Bill.

"222a.—(1) No emblem of any religious denomination, order, sect, society or association, shall be displayed in or on any public school in the province, nor shall any person teach or be permitted to teach in any public school in the province while wearing the garb of any such religious denomination, order, sect, society or association."

Then there are the penalty clauses and the last clause is this:

"(4) Where it appears to the minister that a board of trustees of any public school district is permitting or has permitted a violation of subsection (1), such school district shall not be entitled to receive any grant out of money appropriated by the Legislature, in respect of the period of such violation."

In other words, where any of these things are to be done in the public school, public funds are not to be used in order to maintain that school in existence. The law itself would infer a difference between public and minority schools which would constitute a reason for forming minority schools which, under such law, would become in every sense separate schools.

Now, Sir, there are a few things to take into consideration because a proposal of this kind cannot be confined to one local school district nor can a proposal of this kind be confined in its affect to any one Province of Canada. This question, Mr. Speaker, is a national question. It is not a provincial question nor has anyone in this Dominion who has ever sought to make use of it for political purposes, convinced any person that it is merely a local matter and not a national matter.

The discussions referred to by the Leader of the Conservative Party are based upon a propaganda which has been circulated not only in the press of Western Canada, not only in the press of the Province of Saskatchewan, but it has been circulated in the press of Canada, from one end to the other. Nor, Mr. Speaker, has it been confined to the Dominion of Canada. It has been sent in articles from time to time over to the Old Land to be published in the press of the Old Country in order that it might have its effect upon the people who are living over there and be recopied into our papers for local effect.

Slandering Saskatchewan

I have in my hand a copy of the *Toronto Telegram*. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that, about two months ago, I received from an immigration agent who is located in Glasgow exactly the same article which appears in the *Telegram* dated from Regina and published in the *London Times*. In the letter which I received, the immigration agent, who happened to be a personal friend of my own from the Province of Manitoba, wrote to me after having interviewed the editor of the *Times* and asked me for information with regard to the statements which were made in the *London Times* that he might refute the statements which he knew to be false. This particular article had to do with the immigration policy of the Federal Government more particularly as it affected the harvesters who were in Saskatchewan, last fall. I am not going to read all this article, which is three columns long, but I am going to read the outstanding sections which had to do with these discussions which have been taking place in the Province;

"Regina, Sask., Sept. 12—(Special) * * *

and, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is very special! Listen to the first sentence:

"It's the European settlers that are making this experiment so difficult."

and it goes on to state this:

"ENGLISH NOT WANTED"

"It is no source of surprise to the old timers around here. No man who speaks English need apply. That is the rule all around these European foreign settlements," one of the old English farmers at Moose Jaw explained in discussing the case. "It is not merely so in farm work. It is equally true in the small towns and villages. All the business signs, clerks and proprietors are foreign. Any English-speaking commercial man who 'makes' Saskatchewan knows it is useless to try to sell to these people. Even the big farm implement manufacturers in the east are forced to appoint as their agents here men who can speak the language of these European hordes."

They are speaking now of the district around Moose Jaw, and every member of the House knows there is scarcely an element of truth in that statement. Then the next one—note the headings (holding up the paper): "English not wanted;" "Against English."

"Then in politics they are, of course, favoured everywhere as against the Englishman. The school inspectors, highway inspectors, all the workers paid by the Government in these alien districts, all on the pay rolls must speak the language of Central Europe."

That statement is made under a Regina date-line. I would like to know who the writer of that article is. Who is the gentleman in the City of Regina who keeps continually sending articles of this type to the *Toronto Telegram* and sometimes to the *London Times* in order to paint the conditions in Saskatchewan in this manner? I venture to state that, if his name could be published in this Province, that man could not continue to carry on business in the City of Regina.

I do not know who he is, but you will note that his article says that the school inspectors and highway inspectors in this Province have to be able, in certain sections at least, to speak the language of Central Europe. Well, Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there is one school inspector in this Province who can speak any of the languages of Central Europe. One of our ablest school inspectors, who, I think, was born in this country but of European extraction is still able to speak his mother tongue—Ukrainian. Another gentleman goes out to investigate and adjust certain difficulties in connection with school districts. He, and probably his ancestors, were Canadian-born, but he is able to speak the French language, and is able to make investigations more thorough in some districts because of that.

Mr. Cross: French is not a foreign language in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Quite so, but it is one of the languages of Europe although not Central Europe. Well, then, we will say there is only one man on the whole staff going out from the Department of Education who speaks a language of Central Europe, and still we are confronted with statements of that kind.

A National, even International Question

I want to draw attention to the fact that this is not a matter which has been, or can be, confined within the boundary lines of the Province of Saskatchewan. It is a national; an international question, in some ways; but it is more than anything else a question which concerns the Commonwealth of Nations of which we form a part. All of the religions known to man are believed in and worshipped under by people living somewhere within the boundaries of the British Empire. As a result, anything we do in the Dominion of Canada which reflects in any way on the religious beliefs of any people, no matter who they may be or what those beliefs may be, anything we may do or say as public men in this Province has its reflex in the British Empire, somewhere, and particularly in other parts of the Dominion of Canada outside the Province of Saskatchewan. I would say for that reason it is necessary that an understanding should be had as to just what the people of Saskatchewan think of the proposal to bring down legislation of the kind which is suggested now.

It was stated by the Attorney-General a few moments ago, that this was one of the foremost questions before the Fathers of Confederation before Canada was formed into a Dominion. In order to impress that upon your mind, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read, even at the risk of being a little tedious, considerable from an address that was given in 1865 during the debates in the then Parliament of the United Canadas having to do with Confederation. I am going to quote from the speech of Hon. George Brown. Those who have studied the Canadian History of that period will remember this: The one outstanding opponent of separate schools, whether in Upper Canada, in Lower Canada, or in any part of Canada in the days before Confederation, was the leader of the Reform Party in Upper Canada, Hon. George Brown. He was discussing Resolution No. 6 which was passed in the Conference held in the City of Quebec previous to the formation of Confederation.

You will remember that as a result of this Conference there was formed in Canada a Coalition Government and into that Coalition Government entered men of all different ideas throughout Canada as it then was, and the one outstanding man who was opposed to the very sentiment contained in this resolution was chosen to speak to the resolution when it was before the House. There was an obvious reason for that. Listen to his first comment!

"The people of Upper Canada will have the entire control of their local matters, and will no longer have to betake themselves to Quebec for leave to open a road, to select a county town, or appoint a coroner. But I am told that to this general principle of placing all local matters under local control, an exception has been made in regard to the common schools. The clause complained of is as follows:

"The local legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting education; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their Denominational Schools at the time when the Union goes into operation."

"Now, I need hardly remind the House that I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned."

In other words, he was opposed to the use of public money for sectarian education.

"I have never had any hesitation on that point. I have never been able to see why all the people of the province, to whatever sect they may belong, should not send their children to the same common schools to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors—and so long as the religious faith of the children is uninterfered with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot conceive any sound objection to mixed schools. But while in the Conference and elsewhere I have always maintained this view, and always given my vote against sectarian public schools, I am bound to admit, as I have always admitted, that the sectarian system, carried to the limited extent it has yet been in Upper Canada, and confined as it chiefly is to cities and towns, has not been a very great practical injury. The real cause of alarm was that the admission of the sectarian principle was there, and that at any moment it might be extended to such a degree as to split up our school system altogether."

"There are but a hundred separate schools in Upper Canada, out of some four thousand, and all Roman Catholic."

This was at the time of Confederation. Now that view, Mr. Speaker, read in the light of the experience we have had in Canada from that time to this is a strange commentary upon the views held by a man so able as Honourable George Brown and upon the views of others of his time equally capable with him, because we have had that type of school in the Dominion from that time down to the present in a number of provinces, and the result has not been what he feared it might have been. Our school system has not been split up after an experience of sixty years. He goes on to say:

"But if the Roman Catholics are entitled to separate schools and to go on extending their operations, so are the members of the Church of England, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and all other sects. No candid Roman Catholic will deny this for a moment; and there lay the great danger to our educational fabric, that the separate system might gradually extend itself until the whole country was studded with nurseries of sectarianism, most hurtful to the best interests of the province, and entailing an enormous expense to sustain the hosts of teachers that so prodigal a system of public instruction must inevitably entail."

Again, our experience of the last sixty years is sufficient commentary on that view. This is the important part of this statement.

A Concession that made Confederation Possible

"Now it is known to every honourable member of this House that an Act was passed in 1863, as a final settlement of this sectarian controversy. I was not in Quebec at the time, but if I had been there I would have voted against that Bill, because it extended the facilities for establishing separate schools. It had, however, this good feature, that it was accepted by the Roman Catholic authorities, and carried through Parliament as a final

compromise of the question in Upper Canada. When, therefore, it was proposed that a provision should be inserted in the Confederation scheme to bind that compact of 1863 and declare it a final settlement, so that we should not be compelled, as we have been since 1849, to stand constantly to our arms awaiting fresh attacks upon our common school system, the proposition seemed to me one that was not rashly to be rejected."

- And then he makes his final statement in regard to it, and it is this:

"I admit that, from my point of view, this is a blot on the scheme before the House; it is, confessedly, one of the concessions from our side that had to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But assuredly, I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of honourable gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the bill of 1863. But it was urged that though this arrangement might perhaps be fair as regards Upper Canada, it was not so as regards Lower Canada, for there were matters of which the British population have long complained, and some amendments to the existing School Act were required to secure them equal justice. Well, when this point was raised, gentlemen of all parties in Lower Canada at once expressed themselves prepared to treat it in a frank and conciliatory manner, with a view to removing any injustice that might be shown to exist; and on this understanding the educational clause was adopted by the Confederation."

In other words, he states definitely, after having set down his whole argument in connection with the question, that Confederation without this compromise would have been an impossibility in 1865. We, in the Dominion of Canada today, without that compromise would not be enjoying the privileges and blessings which come from having a united country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

You might ask: What has that compromise brought about educationally in the different provinces in the Dominion of Canada? The Attorney-General has intimated to the House what it has meant so far as legislation is concerned. There is no legislation on the Statute Books of any of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada such as now is proposed to be placed upon the Statute Books of the Province of Saskatchewan. This result was obtained because the spirit of Confederation has been adhered to by the Legislature in every province down to the present time. Nor is there any regulation under any legislation which would accomplish what is now proposed to this House.

Local Control the Vital Factor

But, Mr. Speaker, different methods have been adopted in the different provinces of Canada in order to arrive at a position which is somewhat similar in all the provinces. We have quoted to us occasionally the results which have been attained in Manitoba, British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces without separate schools, and we have quoted to us occasionally the results which have been attained in the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta with separate schools. But when you go to these different provinces, whether east or west, and examine into the conditions which do exist both in relation to the placing of teachers in these schools and as to what is required of teachers occupying positions in those schools, you will find they are very similar all over the Dominion of Canada. If you examine the constitution of each of the three Maritime Provinces or the Province of British Columbia, you will find that they are operating their schools under a provision placed in their constitution which is very similar to that of this Province. You will find an examination of the practice followed will convince that separate schools have been found unnecessary both before and since Confederation, because the control of the schools on these matters is left almost absolutely, if not absolutely, with the local school board. In every instance that is the case.

That is the marked difference, Mr. Speaker, between the conditions in all the provinces of Canada and the condition that would prevail here if we were to embark upon and practise a system which would take away the right of the board to pass judgment upon certain matters. If we were to pass this legislation, we would take away from the board that degree of control which rests with it in all the other provinces of Canada when dealing with religious instruction, the decorations in schools, or with the placing in those schools of properly qualified teachers under the rules and regulations of the Department. We would be taking the first step in the direction of centralised control over such matters, and I would ask the House is it fitting that this Province of all the provinces should be the first to move in such a direction. I hope to show that it would not be fitting.

In order that the House may not be left with the impression that there is only one authority, and that authority the Hon. George Brown, in connection with this point, I am going to come down to the year 1875 when the legislation was being passed in the Dominion House having regard to education in the North West Territories. That legislation read like this:

"Section 11: When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the North West Territories, the Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect of education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the rate-payers of any district or portion of the North West Territories, or any lesser portion or

subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor: and further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

That legislation was dealt with in the Dominion House and passed unanimously. At that time, Mr. Blake was leading the Opposition in the House at Ottawa. He spoke to the question and in speaking to it he made this statement:

"He regarded it as essential under the circumstances of the country, and in view of the deliberations during the last few days, that a general principle should be laid down in the bill with respect to public instruction. He did believe that we ought not to introduce into that territory the heartburnings and difficulties with which certain other portions of the Dominion and other countries had been afflicted. It seemed to him, having regard to the fact that, as far as we could expect at present, the general character of that population would be somewhat analogous to the population of Ontario, that there should be some provision in the constitution by which they should have conferred on them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the Province of Ontario. The principles of local self-government and the settling of the question of public instruction seemed to him ought to be the cardinal principle of the measure."

The Position in Other Provinces

That, Mr. Speaker, goes back to the conclusions reached by Blake. The principle of local control vested in local units touching such matters was admitted by Blake and advocated because similar to Ontario. Those here tonight who are students of history and know the story of the development of education in the Maritime Provinces will remember that when Joseph Howe was discussing the entrance of Nova Scotia into Confederation he took the position that the one thing that would make unnecessary in the Maritime Provinces the adoption of separate schools as they had them in Ontario and Quebec, would be the continuance of absolute control over religious teaching with the school boards in the local communities. That is the policy that has been followed in the Maritime Provinces from that time down to the present. The control of the engagement of teachers, and the control of religious instruction in the Province of Nova Scotia is largely in the hands of the school boards under very broad regulations that have been passed by the Department of Education there. That applies to all the Maritime Provinces and largely to the Province of British Columbia.

In Quebec, they have a Council of Education but that Council I am told has never met. It is composed of both Protestants and Roman Catholics. There is a Protestant Committee and a Catholic Committee and while under the constitution it is provided that they may meet as a Council they do not meet as a Council. They meet as two committees. The Protestant Committee conducts the affairs of the Protestant schools and the Roman Catholic Committee conducts the affairs of the Catholic Schools. Amounts of money are voted by the Legislature to both these committees and I must say that, judging from my investigations, there is no Government in any province of Canada that is more fair to the minority than is the Government of the Province of Quebec. As a matter of fact I found, when I was investigating their institutions that, while they made a grant of \$25,000 to the deaf and dumb institute that is run by the Catholic Church, they made identically the same grant of \$25,000 to the deaf and dumb institute run for the benefit of the Protestant people, despite the fact that only a very small percentage of the people are of the Protestant faith.

That practice is followed in connection with other institutions in Quebec and in connection with practically all matters that have to do with the two sects. In other words, any person who has ever investigated the activities of Governments whether they be Liberal or Conservative in the old Province of Quebec, recognises the fact that they have gone the limit in being fair to the minority. They have lived up to the letter and to the spirit of Confederation as it was laid down in the beginning.

So far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, they saw fit to follow, in that Province, a little different policy from that followed in the Maritime Provinces, to arrive at the same results. I wish to emphasise that there are separate school districts in Ontario. They saw fit to make it possible to have separate school districts in that province. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we have no separate school districts in this Province in the sense that they have separate school districts in Ontario. They have school districts that are public school districts and then they have established other districts that are entirely separate districts. These separate school districts are not coterminous in their boundaries with any public school district. They are entirely separate districts and have separate school boards for those separate school districts. They have different inspectors for those districts, the inspectors being appointed in a different manner from the regular school inspectors. They have complete separation, including different text books, different curricula and different regulations governing religious instruction and all that sort of thing. There is a separate school system in Ontario set up under their law. There is no such thing in this Province. The amendment proposed here would much more readily apply to the Ontario system without interference with the original intention than to the Saskatchewan system.

The Manitoba Law

When we come to the Province of Manitoba conditions are somewhat different again, and those who have read carefully the decisions of the Privy Council dealing with the non-establishment of separate schools in the Province of Manitoba will know this: That the interpretation placed upon the law in Manitoba by the Privy Council was somewhat different from the intention of those who actually passed the law at the time that it was before the Dominion House.

I do not think I need go very far into this matter. I think every member of this House is fairly familiar with it, but I am going to read to you the finding of the Privy Council in connection with the Manitoba case. You will remember that the whole matter there depended on the words "By practice." In other provinces, any schools established by law before Confederation were to continue to exist after Confederation, so far as they provided for the teaching of either the Roman Catholic or Protestant religions. Under the Manitoba law, it read "by law or by practice," and the schools so established were supposed to be continued. They continued in Manitoba a type of school which was established by law in the form of a public school and a type of church school established by practice in the form of a separate school both of which were supported by taxes. An appeal was taken to the Privy Council and here is the decision:

"Such being the main provisions of *The Public School Act, 1890*, their Lordships have to determine whether that Act prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the union. Notwithstanding *The Public Schools Act, 1890*, Roman Catholics and members of every other religious body in Manitoba are free to establish schools throughout the province; they are free to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary subscription; they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school."

That is the finding of the Privy Council. They are free to establish any kind of Protestant or Catholic religious school in the Province of Manitoba. The only restriction placed upon them is that they cannot tax the people for the carrying on of that school. They can carry it on by charging fees or by voluntary subscription, and they cannot tax the people for the purpose because the words "by practice" only cover a type of school which was being operated by a church, upon subscription before the territory became a province. The position today, therefore, is that they can establish any type of school, whether of Catholic or Protestant faith, provided the tax rates are not charged with their maintenance, and no one can compel them to take their children out of that school and put them into a public school.

Saskatchewan's Superior Position

We are not in that position in the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We are in a position superior to that if put to the test. In Manitoba it becomes essential that greater latitude be given in exercising the right of local control than in any other province because of the constitution as interpreted by the Privy Council, and as a matter of fact latitude is given.

In the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta the story with regard to our schools is old. We, in this Province, under our constitution because of legislation passed (not by the Legislature of this Province, but because of legislation passed in 1901 and because of the reference made to that legislation in our constitution of 1905) have a system of schools established, insofar as religious instruction is concerned, permitting the teaching of religion, under the school law of the Territories of 1901. This permits the teaching of religion for one half-hour in any school operated under the Act with the decision resting with the local board. They have the same in Alberta. That law does not make provision for the establishment of separate school districts in the Ontario sense of the term. It is true that the word "district" is used, but no new area is set up to form a new separate district as in Ontario.

We have compromised between the Ontario and the Maritime Provinces' plan of providing for difficulties which may arise as a result of teaching religion in schools maintained by common tax rates. Down in the Maritimes they left the matter entirely to local control so far as religious teaching was concerned. The minority within a district has no redress apart from its influence upon the board. Because of their natural divisions with the Catholic population living in one section and the Protestant population largely in other parts, except in cities like Halifax, they have got along very well in the Province of Nova Scotia. The same methods have been adopted in other parts of the Maritime Provinces. But out here there are no natural boundaries between Catholic and Protestant settlements.

We had, in the early days, at the time our school law was being formulated, men from all of the Eastern Provinces and more particularly from Ontario and from the Maritime Provinces. These men apparently thought they were selecting the best features of the law which has to do with education in the Maritime Provinces and in Ontario and applying those features to suit the different conditions which existed in the Western part of Canada. What did they do? They, in the first place, established under our law this feature of local control.

I do not ask you to take my word for that. There has been going on in the Province of Alberta a discussion with regard to larger areas and after making a full enquiry into the whole matter they have published a pamphlet, "Rural Education in Alberta," submitted by Hon. Perrin Baker, the Minister of Education. In that Mr. Baker makes this statement:

"Each of these administrative units is needed, because each has something to do which cannot be so well done by either of the other two, if done at all.

"(1) The local board is needed to discharge numerous duties, and exercise important powers now vested in it by *The School Act*."

Mr. MacPherson: That is the new scheme?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Yes, that is the new scheme. He is first of all going to divide the province into 21 areas, of 150 school districts, each retaining its local board; then he is going to have a general council or general board composed of the chairmen of the local boards to meet from time to time, more like a conference or convention, to discuss certain matters of general policy. Then underneath that again, he is going to have a board of five working along with the general council covering the whole area of 150 districts which would have to do largely with the engaging of teachers. Thus there are three different administrative bodies in connection with these units which he is going to establish. Then he says this with regard to the local boards:

"The responsibility of determining what religious instruction, if any, shall be given in the school must, under our constitution, continue to rest with it (the local board)."

He makes that plain statement—"the responsibility of determining what religious instruction, if any, shall be given in the school must, under our constitution, continue to rest with the local board." Now their constitution is the same as ours, word for word, so that, if this is a proper expression of opinion with regard to the Province of Alberta, it would also apply here.

In other words there was placed at the very foundation of the organisation of the units in this Province and the organisation of our school system, the principle of placing responsibility for control with respect to religious instruction within the schools in the local boards. That, Mr. Speaker, is the situation we are confronted with. But let me again point out here the difference which exists between our schools in the Province of Saskatchewan and the schools in the Province of Ontario.

Saskatchewan Quite Different from Ontario

Down there, as I pointed out a moment ago, they have separate school districts. Here, we have only separate school buildings and boards. We say if, after having exercised this right of local control, the majority governing there is not giving complete satisfaction in the district, then the minority, whether they be Roman Catholic or Protestant, can form a separate school board in that district and build a separate building and have it administered, including the engagement of the teacher, by their own board. Then again the other principle applies. Catholics are only to be taxed for their separate school and the Protestants for the public school or *vice versa*.

Now that, in a few words, is the position which we are in today in connection with the schools in this province. The point to be emphasised is that our system provides for local control as they have it in the Maritimes but when, in extreme cases, there is disagreement, the Ontario idea of separation is followed to the extent of permitting a separation of the children into a separate building under a separate board; but there is no new area set up as a district nor is there any separate system with differently qualified teachers or inspectors, different books, curricula or regulations.

Local boards in the Province of Ontario have been doing certain things to which objection has been taken and in order to show that Premier Ferguson, who is also Minister of Education in Ontario, holds the same view as Perrin Baker in the Province of Alberta, I am going to read to you one paragraph which I read at an earlier time this Session in this House. May I first read to explain it, one paragraph from the *Sentinel* of December 6, 1928, and I would call upon the members to witness that in reading it I am not holding that paper up to derision. They say this:

"They have turned a Public School into a French Roman Catholic School with sectarian emblems on the walls, and a Roman Catholic teacher in charge."

There has not been anything more definite than that in the way of a charge, made against the Government of this Province or the Department of Education in this Province. In order to let you understand that they are talking about Premier Ferguson, let me read an earlier sentence:

"Sandwich East, Ont., Nov. 30.—A state of affairs has developed in the Public School in this district that is calculated to bring discredit upon Premier Ferguson's new plan of dealing with bilingual teaching. The report of the Commission he appointed expressed deep satisfaction with conditions in the county of Essex. But judging from what is happening in the school hereabouts the Commissioners were hoodwinked, or else the French school trustees are presuming upon the change in the school regulation to violate the policy of the department."

There is, apparently, an attempt being made to hoodwink under a Conservative Government in Canada. When that matter was brought up in the press of Ontario and discussed there what did Premier Ferguson say? I am quoting now from the *Toronto Globe* of Friday, November 30, 1928, and this is what it says:

"There will be no action taken by the Provincial Board of Education in respect of the two religious pictures, said to be Roman Catholic in character, displayed in Public School Section No. 6, Sandwich East, Premier Ferguson stated yesterday. It was a purely local matter, he declared, and action had already been taken by the school inspector."

Purely a local matter! Not a matter which the central board would take any action in connection with! I only quote this in order to show that the understanding of this whole matter at the time of Confederation has been adhered to in all the Provinces of Canada insofar as matters of this kind have been concerned.

Conditions in the Provinces Compared

You will be interested to know what has resulted in each province through the application of its various systems to the conditions existing in the different provinces. We sent an enquiry to the different provinces of Canada to find out what the condition is in regard to religious teaching in the schools more particularly as it is affected by the engagement of Sisters.

In connection with British Columbia we have no data to give you. In Alberta there are 5,380 teachers. In the public schools there are 27 Sisters. In the separate schools there are 83. If you work that out you will find that the proportion is that 1 in 49 of the teachers teaching in that Province are Sisters. Now, in Saskatchewan, there are 8,114 teachers teaching in the Province and we have 64 Sisters teaching in the public schools and 23 teaching in the old Catholic parochial schools that were established under the Act of 1875 which I read to you a few moments ago, and we have 66 teaching in the separate schools in the Province. That figures out to approximately the same proportion as they have in Alberta; that is, 1 in 54. Then take Manitoba where they have no separate schools. Manitoba has 3,700 teachers in its public schools and there are 80 Sisters, Mr. Speaker, according to the return, teaching in the public schools of Manitoba, or one in 46. That is a larger proportion than we have even in the Province of Saskatchewan taking public and separate schools combined.

Then in Ontario they have 16,016 teachers with 1,077 Sisters and 92 Brothers teaching in the schools. It is true that of those a large proportion is teaching in the separate schools. The return does not indicate whether any are teaching in the purely public schools, but we know this from a statement which I have here that in the Normal School that was provided by Mr. Ferguson in the City of Ottawa for the training of bilingual teachers that they had, last term, 20, nearly all of whom were Sisters, in training. Of those that are trained a large proportion of them were trained in the Normal School established for that purpose who will no doubt teach in bilingual schools in the Province. But there are such teachers there now, and this return shows that one in every 16 teachers is a Sister or a Brother. So you can see that in the old Province of Ontario, they have about three for every one in the Province of Saskatchewan who is either a Sister or a Brother of the Roman Catholic religion.

Then in Quebec conditions are different. They have 17,692 teachers of whom 6,316 are Sisters. These, of course, are all teaching in the Catholic schools. In New Brunswick, they have 2,533 teachers and the returns we got state that they do not know how many Sisters there are, but Sisters teach there. In Nova Scotia there are 3,358 teachers, 210 of whom are Sisters, again a proportion of 1 to 16 to the number of teachers. In Prince Edward Island with 615 teachers they have 26 Sisters—in the public schools, or 1 in 30.

In the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, working under our present law and regulations we have fewer Sisters teaching in our schools than can be found in any of the other provinces of Canada from which we have the data. It is not, then, to correct a condition existing in Saskatchewan which does not prevail elsewhere that we are asked to pass this legislation. Each of the Sisters teaching in Saskatchewan schools is fully qualified, the same as any other teacher, and that is not the case in some of the provinces. I might add that out of 4,822 school districts in Saskatchewan only 43 are engaging sisters.

The Campaign Against Sir Oliver Mowat

But, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this whole question I would not be doing justice to it if I simply dealt with it from the point of view I have been dealing with it, down to the present, giving you the facts as they do exist in different provinces, and calling your attention to the system set down throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada because of arrangements entered into at the time of Confederation. I must give some attention to attacks of a similar nature to those now being made in the Province of Saskatchewan that have been made in other provinces of the Dominion of Canada at other times. But, Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to do this, might I again emphasise the fact that we, in the Province of Saskatchewan, are concerned more than anything else with maintaining a mutual spirit of understanding between the different sections of our population.

In order to indicate to you that the kind of controversy that is going on here is not a new thing (people who have lived in this province since 1905 know it is not new here) although the phase that it has taken on in this Province in recent months is something that is new to the Province of Saskatchewan, I intend to quote from the "Life of Sir Oliver Mowat." Those who have read carefully the story of Confederation will remember that he was another of those men

who, as a "Father of Confederation" was an advocate of so-called national schools. But, in years later, when he was Prime Minister of Ontario, and called upon to administer the affairs of that Province in conformity with the arrangement entered into at Confederation he took the same stand for fair dealing which had been adhered to by all his contemporaries.

I will read to you an extract from a Speech delivered by Mowat in the year 1890. It is a review of the political discussion in connection with this question which had taken place in Ontario from 1883 down to 1890. Those of you who are familiar with the political history of the period, about 1883, will remember that the cry that was raised in the Province of Ontario was against the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat because he had not been friendly enough to the Roman Catholic Church. Then, in 1886, under the leadership of the same men, the cry was contained in the words which you find at the top of these pages "No Popery"—very similar to the cry that my friend from Arm River told us was made in his constituency, "A vote for Waugh is a vote for the Pope!" I will read you what Mowat said in reply to this campaign:

"Accordingly, in the campaign of 1886, it was proclaimed to Protestants that my Protestant colleagues and myself were traitors to our faith; that we gave everything to the Roman Catholics; that we were obedient servants of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy; and that our subserviency was shown by our legislation and by our exercise of the Government patronage; by the very things, in fact, which in 1883 lost us some Protestant votes. A religious cry, however little reason it may have, has always some effect; but neither in 1883 nor in 1886 was the effect great enough to accomplish the purpose aimed at. Our public record was so satisfactory to the country that we were able to stand our ground against even a misleading religious cry. Our opponents are now making preparations for the general election of 1890."

and I would put in place of that "our opponents are now making preparations for the General Election of 1929 or 1930, hence this bill and the discussions they hope will follow":

"The experience of four general elections makes them hopeless of victory on an issue as to the general merits or demerits of our administration of public affairs. But the recent excitement created amongst Protestants by *The Jesuits' Estates Act* of Quebec has revived old hopes from a 'No Popery' cry; and our opponents have striven, and are striving, with might and main to direct this excitement into opposition to the Ontario Government, although that Government had nothing to do with the Act which gave rise to the excitement. They have even said, in their reckless unscrupulousness, that I advised that Act and aided in its preparation."

They are even attempting to say, now, Mr. Speaker, in their 'reckless unscrupulousness' that I, as Premier of this Province have entered into a trumped-up arrangement with the Federal Government and the Province of Quebec to have a general exodus of French-speaking people from that Province into this, so as to dominate the population of this Province. Then he goes on:

"It is an absurd statement: they have asserted what no intelligent person believes; but they evidently count on having readers or hearers who are not intelligent. What they thus assert they cannot pretend to have a particle of evidence to prove. I need not say here, or anywhere, that I had nothing to do with advising or preparing *The Jesuits' Estates Act*, and nothing with the transaction which that Act carried out. I knew nothing of it from first to last, except what I learned from time to time from the public journals, as you all did. With equal unscrupulousness, it is further said that I had made a general agreement with Mr. Mercier 'to put no serious obstacles in the way of propagating nationalism in the schools of Eastern Ontario'; etc. Here again our assailants assert what they do not pretend that they have anything to prove. They could not have, for there was no such agreement. No word ever passed between Mr. Mercier and myself, directly or indirectly, as to 'propagating nationalism' in Ontario or in any of its schools. The suggestion is absurd. In fact not a word of any kind has passed, directly or indirectly, between us on the subject of these schools."

He continues to list the same claims and arguments which are now being advanced against this Government and answers in the same terms as we, whether the claims be with regard to immigration or schools:

"Our assailants delight in general statements, quite false, and usually unaccompanied with even the pretence of proof. In this case their tactics are to declare, however falsely, and to keep on declaring, that, Protestants as we are, we have sold ourselves to Rome; that we procure the passing of just such laws as Rome, through its bishops or clergy dictates or permits; that we make just such appointments as the Roman hierarchy choose to demand; that we have entered into a conspiracy with that church to 'destroy our public schools'; and that we give to those who hold the Romish faith other unjust advantages, to the prejudice of the Protestant faith; which is also the faith of most of ourselves in the Government, and most of our friends in the Legislature and in the country. They say that we have perpetrated all this iniquity and, according to one astute journal, with 'devilish ingenuity,' as the price of the Roman Catholic vote."

The book then states:

"The premier then went on to point out that of the seven members of the Government six were Protestants; that of the fifty-seven Liberals in the Legislative Assembly, forty-nine were Protestants."

Exactly the same situation here—Of the seven members of this Government, six are Protestants. There were 57 members at that time in Ontario, and 49 of them Protestants. Here, of the 63 members of this Assembly, I think 57 are Protestants—a little higher proportion than there was at that time in Ontario. Then Mowat goes on to say:

"That if, as stated by the Opposition, the aggregate of Roman Catholic votes for Reform candidates was larger than for Opposition candidates, it should be remembered that the Government received more votes than the Opposition from nearly every Protestant denomination; and, in conclusion, he said, 'I venture to say that if any political or municipal office should adopt as a battle-cry, 'No Presbyterianism,' Presbyterians like myself would not be likely to vote for that party or candidate, whatever had been our previous relations with either of them.'

Mr. Speaker, I repeat once more that here you have exactly the same thing which is being repeated in this Province at present. Away back at that time, Ontario was being threatened with a French invasion, according to those who attacked the Government:

"In 1889 a prominent member of the Opposition, Mr. T. Dixon Craig, of West Durham, had unsuccessfully fathered a motion of want of confidence in the Government on this ground, declaring that 'The English tongue is the language of the Province of Ontario, and no system of public instruction which does not recognise and act upon the recognition, that the English language is to be the language of such schools shall be approved of by the Department of Education as satisfactory to the House.' In support of this motion many absurd statements were made. Ontario was said to be threatened with a 'French Invasion,' under the auspices of Archbishop Lynch, Mr. Mowat and the Hon. G. W. Ross, and a foreign language and an alien religion were to be gradually introduced into the public schools of the province until the virus should infect the whole body politic; and Ontario was some day to awaken to the fact that she was under the control of an Apostolic Delegate, instead of a free legislature.

"It is difficult to write seriously of such allegations, yet those who desire to verify their accuracy have only to consult the columns of the *Mail and Empire*, the *Orange Sentinel*, and other Conservative newspapers issued during the spring of 1889, in order to be convinced that they were repeatedly and deliberately made."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial writer of *The Star* and some of our friends opposite have been reading the political history of Ontario.

Remains True to Spirit of Confederation

In the old Province of Ontario, with almost identically the same proportion of population representative of Protestants and Catholics as we have in the Province of Saskatchewan, at each election the people returned, with an increased majority, the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat and kept him in power as long as that kind of campaign was conducted. Our opponents must have neglected to read the whole story and benefit by the moral.

I have sufficient faith in the good judgment of the people of Saskatchewan and the whole Dominion of Canada to believe that we can settle any little disputes that arise in our school districts in the same manner as we have been solving them since 1905 in Saskatchewan and since 1867 throughout Canada. We have been settling our difficulties by this method in 1928. We can continue to solve them in this Province without the assistance of the legislation proposed in this Bill. Only the day after this Bill was introduced in the House, I had a complaint from only one individual from one school district in the Province of Saskatchewan to the effect that there was a crucifix hanging up in the school his child was attending and that he objected to it. I took the matter up with the local people and had word back from that district on Monday last that the crucifix had been taken down. Simply by sending word down to the district that an individual objected to the crucifix upon the walls of the school, the people who are in the majority, considering the rights of the minority, took the crucifix down. We have had no difficulty in matters of that kind excepting during the last twelve months.

We have been able, down to date, even during 1928, to settle every one of the disputes that have arisen; and I want to say that this is due not particularly to the efforts of the Department of Education. Our political opponents have been saying—why does not the Department of Education do more? There is only one reason, and that is because the good commonsense of the people in our school districts all over this Province make it unnecessary for us to do more. They settle these problems and they settle them in the lasting interests of the people of the whole Province of Saskatchewan, and in the more lasting interests of the people of the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

I would say that, as the Prime Minister of this Province, I would leave public life in disgrace and dishonour if I were to betray the principles which underly the lasting settlement which has been established in this Province resting on the good feeling that exists as between the peoples of different nationality and race. They are building in Saskatchewan in the present. They are to build in Canada in the future as they are building in Saskatchewan in the present, moulding themselves into a strong Canadian nationality, honouring the Union Jack because of the freedom it gives, honouring the Union Jack because of the liberty it gives, honouring the Union Jack because those who have established the Empire, in establishing it, have honoured the rights of minorities throughout the length and breadth of that Empire even as we Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan, though we were to face political defeat in accomplishing it, believe we are doing the proper thing in defending the principles I am proclaiming tonight. I will vote for the compromises which formed the fundamental basis of Confederation, and against the Bill.

HON. T. C. DAVIS

Attorney General

Address delivered in the Legislature on January 29, 1929, on proposed amendments to The School Act.

Mr. Speaker,—I might be permitted, and I think it is my duty as Attorney General, to say a few words in connection with the Bill proposed by my honourable friend, (*Mr. Anderson*) and I want, Mr. Speaker, to confine myself largely to the legal aspect of the Bill of which he has just moved the Second Reading. As I said a minute ago, I consider it my duty as Attorney General, and as a member of this Government, to give the House some idea of what the law is in this regard in Saskatchewan and in other Provinces of Canada, so that when the members are discussing this Bill, they may have the background and know what the legal status of legislation of this kind is in the different provinces.

I might say I have made a fairly exhaustive study of the law in our Province and in other provinces and in addition to that, I have been in communication, indirectly, with other Departments of Education for the purpose of ascertaining what they have done in the matter of legislation of this character.

Before going into that and as a necessary preliminary, I would like to discuss for a moment the platform of the Conservative Party in connection with this particular legislation. Our Conservative friends met in the City of Saskatoon in, I think, the month of March, 1928, and as I understood from the newspapers, the party was represented there by delegates from all over the Province of Saskatchewan. It was heralded in the Press as one of the most representative Conservative Conventions ever held in the Province of Saskatchewan and delegates were there duly elected for the purpose of expressing the will and wish of the Conservatives of Saskatchewan from one end to the other, and for the purpose of promulgating a policy which they would announce and did announce as the policy of the Conservative Party.

They met upon that occasion and proceeded to deal with several matters, particularly with matters in the public mind at the present time, and issued a platform, since broadcast all over the Province. In that platform they dealt with the matter which is the subject matter of this Bill and during their discussion at the Convention they passed a resolution which I understand was the unanimous opinion of all the delegates at that Convention with respect to the matter which is now covered by this particular Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to bear with me a moment while I read this resolution, (and I am subject to correction if I am misquoting):

“That *The School Act* be amended to prohibit the use of any religious emblems in the public schools of the province, where there are pupils or ratepayers of mixed religious denominations and to prohibit the holding of the public school in buildings used for religious purposes except temporarily.”

Now, insofar as that last sentence is concerned it will be noted that no mention is made in the Bill with respect to that particular part of that resolution; but they recommend “that *The School Act* be amended to prohibit the use of any religious emblems in the public schools of the Province,” and this is the proviso: “Where there are pupils or ratepayers of mixed religious denominations.” It will be noticed that the resolution covers only “religious emblems,” and the Leader of the Conservative party says that “Speaks for itself.” They suggest, first of all that we should “prohibit their use” but they qualify that by saying “only in schools of mixed religious denominations.” It will be noticed that no mention is made in the resolution with respect to “garb.”

That was the resolution drafted by Conservatives from all over the Province and contained in the platform of the Conservative party submitted to the people of this Province. In accordance with the policy our Conservative friends apparently have conducted since the opening of this Session of the Legislature, they have appointed an “interpreting committee” which meets every second Saturday in the City of Regina, the purpose of which is to exercise the function of elucidating such points as this, and try to interpret the platform of the Conservative party. This interpreting committee met here two or three Saturdays ago and that “court of interpretation” considered this particular matter and here is the judgment of the court, as reported in the *Regina Daily Star* of January 21, 1929:

“That it is the considered opinion of the Provincial Conservative candidates and the provincial executive here assembled, that the proper interpretation of clause (f), being item 6 of the Conservative platform dealing with education should be, that the use of religious emblems should be prohibited in all public schools in Saskatchewan and that the fair interpretation of religious emblems includes religious garb of any kind worn by teachers. Clause (f) of item 6, which is now amplified and clarified by the foregoing resolution.” * * *

Clause (f) was the clause I read a few moments ago. It will be noted that the resolution said it should be prohibited only "in schools of mixed religious denominations" but this court comes along and says that it means "in all public schools of this Province." Then it goes on to say "that the fair interpretation of religious emblems includes religious garb of any kind worn by teachers." If that statement is correct you will see the attempt which was made to read into the Conservative platform something which was not there. I do not think that anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the English language—not a single schoolboy in Saskatchewan, could put that reading on the resolution passed at the Conservative Convention at Saskatoon. It is impossible without stretching the English language and juggling with it, to reach a conclusion of that kind.

Do Conservatives Mean What They Say?

There is one thing for the people to bear in mind in connection with this attempt at interpretation and that is the effect to be given by the people to the rest of the planks of the Conservative platform. Do they mean what they say or do they mean something entirely different? And will some other interpretation be put on them at a subsequent time? And if this legislation did pass and our Conservative friends were in power and the leader of the Conservative party was administering the legislation passed, what interpretation would he put upon it? And when administering it, would he turn around then and say exactly what the committee says it meant or would he be just as likely to say, "No, it doesn't mean what it says?" Or will he say it means "mixed religious denominations" and administer the law in that way? I think this exhibition of want of faith on the part of the Conservative party, which its leader is presenting, is a sufficient answer to the people as to what reliance can be placed upon any Government formed from that source, if the opportunity were afforded them, to administer a law of that kind.

With respect to the Bill itself, as I said a moment ago, I have made it my business to find out what the law is in the other Provinces of Canada in order that members who follow me who want to discuss this Bill, may be fully conversant with this aspect of the question.

In British Columbia there is no legislation of this character whatsoever. The only restrictions placed upon those teaching in the public schools of that Province are that they must have passed a course authorised in Canada, that the teacher should be a British Subject, that he or she should have certain necessary qualifications and be certificated and licensed to teach. These are the only restrictions in British Columbia and when these requirements are fulfilled the local school board in British Columbia has full authority to decide upon or select and choose their own teachers.

Coming to Saskatchewan—everyone knows what the law is here. It is the same as it is in British Columbia. There are no restrictions here upon who shall teach, except that the teacher be a British subject and have the necessary educational qualifications. Outside of that, the matter is left in the discretion of the local school board. In the Province of Ontario, so often quoted by our friends, the law is identically the same.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in this regard that I am discussing the question of teaching in religious garb. If you look at my honourable friend's Bill it attempts to restrict the use, or prohibit the use, first, of religious emblems and second, it attempts to prevent the wearing, by persons teaching, of religious garb—two distinct things. So, in covering the questions, I am dealing first with the law in the other Provinces with respect to "garb" and then I shall deal with the law respecting the use of religious emblems in other Provinces.

Law in All Provinces the Same

I have dealt with British Columbia and Saskatchewan. Insofar as the Province of Ontario is concerned (and down in New Brunswick the condition is the same), no restriction is placed upon the local school board except the same regulations that the teacher must be a British Subject and have an educational certificate. The same applies in Prince Edward Island, and also in Alberta. The same applies in Manitoba, and in the Province of Quebec, and the same applies in the Province of Nova Scotia. In short, Mr. Speaker, the same applies in every Province in Canada. There is no legislative restriction upon the local school board in their selection of a teacher except the regulations with regard to educational knowledge and the certificate and being a British Subject. Otherwise, in every Province of Canada the matter of whom the teacher shall be is left in the hands of the local school board.

With respect to the use of religious emblems, I have gone into the condition of the law all across Canada. In British Columbia there is no restriction either by way of legislation or regulation respecting the use of religious emblems. In the Province of Alberta, the same thing applies—no restriction by Act of the Legislature or pursuant of powers delegated by the Legislature. In the Province of Saskatchewan, as we know, the same applies. In Manitoba the same applies. In the Province of Quebec the same applies. In Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island, the same condition applies. In all of those seven Provinces there is nothing either by way of legislation or by regulation pursuant to legislation, that prohibits the use of emblems in the schools.

This leaves two Provinces that have regulations with respect to religious emblems, and these are the Province of Ontario and the Province of New Brunswick. In both these Provinces they have regulations with respect to the use of religious emblems in the schools. But they have no legislation. There is nothing on the Statute Books dealing with the matter, but, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, they have delegated to the Minister the right to make certain regulations, and one of these regulations deals with matters of this character, or practices of this character.

Let me refer for a moment to the Ontario legislation upon which they based their particular regulation. It is *The Department of Education Act*, Chapter 322 of *The Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1927*. Section 4 of that Act is as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of any statute in that behalf the Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, may make regulations,—

- (a) for the establishment, organisation, government, courses of study, and examination of the schools, departments, school cadet corps, school gardens, supervised and outdoor playgrounds, institutes and institutions hereinbefore mentioned;".

Now, pursuant to that power given by the Legislature of Ontario to the Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the Minister in Ontario has issued certain regulations, and the only regulation dealing either with religious garb or with the matter of emblems, is this regulation to be found in the General Regulations governing Public and Separate Schools, 1924, Regulation 42, Section 13, Sub-Section 4, which reads as follows:

"Emblems of a denominational character shall not be exhibited in a public school during regular school hours."

Now that is the only law or regulation in the Province of Ontario dealing with the use of religious garb in the public schools or with religious emblems.

Mr. Cross: That only refers to emblems.

Regulations as to Emblems

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let me make it quite clear that there is no legislation of any kind or nature which says that teachers dressed in religious garb shall not teach in the public schools in the Province of Ontario. There is no legislation of any kind or character in the Province of Ontario with respect to emblems but under the section I have read, which delegates certain powers to the Minister,—and this is the only thing to be found either in the law or regulations dealing with the subject matters of the Bill introduced by my honourable friend.

Let me repeat that in nine of the Provinces of Canada there is nothing prohibiting the use of religious garb and in seven Provinces there is nothing against the use of emblems, and in only two Provinces is the use of religious emblems stopped by regulation and these are Ontario and New Brunswick.

I have given you the Ontario law and regulations and I wish to turn now to the New Brunswick law. In the Province of New Brunswick there is nothing prohibiting the use of religious garb by a teacher employed in the public school who is otherwise qualified. But under the law in the Province of New Brunswick the Legislature, by *The School Act*, there, also has delegated certain powers to the Minister subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and Sub-Section (5) of Section 6 of *The New Brunswick School Act* reads as follows:

"The Board of Education shall have power:

- (5) To make regulations for the organisation, government and discipline of schools, for the arrangement and order of school premises, and for the classification of schools and teachers, to appoint examiners of teachers, and to grant and cancel licenses."

You will note that that is very similar to the terms of *The Ontario School Act* delegating certain powers to the Minister. Pursuant to that power in New Brunswick this regulation has been passed which is, I understand, Regulation No. 21:

"Symbols or emblems in the school room; symbols or emblems distinctive of any national or other society, political party, or religious organisation, shall not be exhibited or employed in the school room in its general arrangement or exercises; but nothing herein shall be taken to refer to any peculiarity of the teacher's garb or to the wearing of the cross or other emblem worn by the members of any denomination of Christians or temperance organisations."

They prohibit, by this regulation, the use of religious emblems in the public school, but they make it quite clear that the term "religious emblem" does not include religious garb. They do not prevent, but by inference they even go to the extent of saying, that it is quite permissible for the teacher to be clothed in religious garb at the time she happens to be teaching in the public school, and the only things prevented are those bound by this regulation and passed pursuant to the authority given in *The School Act*.

Saskatchewan Law is Identical

Let us look into the law in the Province of Saskatchewan. Section 6 of *The School Act* reads as follows:

"The Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, shall have power:

1. To make regulations of the department: (a) for the classification, organisation, government, division into grades, examination, supervision and inspection of all schools hereinbefore mentioned;".

Now, if you will compare this section with the Ontario Act and the New Brunswick Act, you will see that they are practically identical. Each one contains the word "government" and I am of the opinion that under this existing legislation in the Province of Saskatchewan and under the power already delegated to the Minister subject to the right and approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, we can make regulations similar to the regulations in the Provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick. We could go further, if we saw fit to do so, and pass regulations prohibiting the use of religious garb and I am clearly of opinion that, by virtue of this existing legislation and the powers delegated by this Legislature to the Minister, we have the very powers that my honourable friend seeks to impose under this Bill. That is we could do, by regulation, the very things which he seeks to include within the purview of this Bill. I trust I have made this clear.

I am clearly of the opinion that the Minister of Education has, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the right to make regulations under Section 6 of *The School Act*, which regulations may include the prohibiting of the wearing of religious garb or the showing of religious emblems in the schools.

In addition, the Minister has another power in Saskatchewan which is to be found in Sub-Section (2) of Section 8, the section referring to the official trustee, which reads as follows:

"The Minister shall have power:

"To appoint an official trustee to conduct the affairs of a district; such official trustee to have all the powers and authorities conferred by this Act upon a board and its officers, and to be remunerated out of the funds of the district or otherwise as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may decide. Upon the appointment of such official trustee, the board, if any, of the district for which he is appointed shall cease to hold office as such:

"Provided that a municipal council may be appointed as official trustee."

If any regulations of that character were passed in this Province and were put into effect under the powers conferred in this Act, every school board would, naturally, be required to comply with the orders and regulations of the Department. If the board fails to comply, or if a dispute arises in connection with some decision of the board, the Government has the power to step in and displace the school board. This last section which I read, leaves the law flexible and leaves any Government which may be in power and may be conducting the school affairs of this Province in the position where it may deal with each case upon the merits of that particular case.

Bill Unnecessary—Minister Has Power

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that I have tried to outline what the law is in the other Provinces of Canada with respect to the use of religious garb; I have tried to outline the law with respect to the use of religious emblems, and I have tried to outline the law in respect of what regulations may be passed, and I have tried to show, and I have shown, I think, that we have the legislative authority here to do what is proposed in this Bill if we see fit so to do.

Now in addition to that there is the point that arises in my mind and one that I am not going to press very hard—it is the question whether or not this Bill is at all in order. As I understand the Rules of the House, once a subject has been debated, it cannot again be voted upon. At the time the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was on, my honourable friend moved an amendment to the Address in Reply which dealt with the subject-matter of this particular Bill and said so in so many words; and having been defeated by a vote of the members on that occasion and having been debated in this Legislature, I doubt very much whether my friend can ask this House to vote again upon this question.

That is the law and I thought it my duty, before this discussion starts, to give to the members of this House the proper background on the legal aspect of the question so that they may be able to discuss this subject.

So far as the merits of the Bill are concerned, the Bill is an amendment to a public Act introduced by a private member and, naturally, every private member is free to express himself and to vote as his conscience dictates. Pursuant to that principle it is, of course, my duty and privilege, to vote, when the time comes for that, with respect to this particular Bill. And as I have made some study of the matter, and have given it a great deal of thought since the introduction of the Bill, I propose to vote upon it according to the dictates of my conscience. In

this I am guided by this thought that, when the Fathers of Confederation started to build Canada they had one of the greatest problems to meet. They had in this country two distinct and separate peoples. They had the French-speaking Catholic people of Quebec and they had the English-speaking Protestant people of Ontario and it was their purpose to weld them into one harmonious nation, and they set out to attain that object. They only did it by a spirit of compromise, of give-and-take, by trying to get together and meet each other's viewpoints, and that is the only way it could be done. They did succeed in bringing harmony and as a result of this the Canadian nation was born. We have continued on for sixty-one years and as a result of the complexity of our situation, a large proportion of the population being Roman Catholic or Protestant, French-speaking or English-speaking, there has always been a certain amount of friction and there always will be a certain amount of friction. We must meet this situation in the same way as did the Fathers of Confederation. Unless we do, we will not be able to continue as a united nation. Anyone who does anything to disrupt that union is in my opinion a traitor to Canada—a traitor to Canada because we all want Canada to be what it has been, a united Canadian nation. With that thought in mind, as a Protestant, as a member of the Legislature, as a British Subject, as a Christian (I hope), as a citizen of Canada, and in accordance with the dictates of my conscience, I do not propose to support this Bill.

HON. J. G. GARDINER

Premier

Speeches in the Legislature on December 6 and 10, 1928, on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

The Honourable Mr. Gardiner, in speaking to the amendment to the motion, proposed by the senior member for Saskatoon City (*Mr. Anderson*), said:

Mr. Speaker,—On arising to speak on the Address and deal for a few moments with the amendment, I may state that I have grave doubts as to whether it is in proper form for an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The matter will be given consideration by the Speaker and by the Clerk and I shall go on for a few moments to address the House.

I may say that I join with those who have already addressed the House in expressing the deepest regret that we have learned of the very serious illness of His Majesty the King. Because of his illness, the Legislature meets this year with the realisation that our people are hoping with an intense desire that he may be returned to health and strength. Since the coronation of the present King his every act has tendered to endear him, and to increase the goodwill and esteem in which all members of the Royal family and particularly the Prince of Wales, are held in all parts of the Empire.

Listening to the story of the development of the constitutional relationships between Throne and people we are brought to a realisation of the spirit of justice and tolerance throughout the Empire which is the essence of real democracy. Because of this experience this House and the people of the Province will be in accord with His Honour's earnestly expressed hope that the Empire will be long blessed by his beneficent rule.

The honourable member from Kinistino, (*Mr. McIntosh*), in moving the Address spoke in his usual clear, concise and very acceptable manner and we on this side of the House are proud to be able to state that with everything to which he has given expression, we are in hearty agreement. In the address delivered by the Seconder (*Mr. Waugh*), the member for the constituency of Arm River who has been returned to this House since it last prorogued as the result of an election which took place there, we have heard the remarks of a man who has already impressed himself on the membership of this House. He has impressed himself on the membership of this House because of the sterling manner in which he delivered that address, because of the very acceptable manner in which he conducted himself in the recent by-election and also because of the fact he was successful in being returned in spite of the type of campaign which was carried on against him.

The Arm River By-election

The election which took place in the constituency of Arm River was one which was surrounded by conditions which were somewhat different from an ordinary election. It was not absolutely necessary that there should have been a by-election in that constituency. Hon. George Scott, the retired member for Arm River, had served his constituency in the Legislature for twenty years and he had served the people of his constituency well. He had served the party to which he belonged well, but what is more important he had served the people of the whole Province of Saskatchewan as Chief Commoner for two different terms of this Legislature. By reason of the fact that he accepted the offer to become a civil servant with the Federal Government, Mr. Scott, was not, thereby, excluded from membership in the Legislature or legally compelled to resign his seat.

There have been precedents in other Provinces where an individual already occupying a seat in the House of Commons, upon getting a position as a provincial official, was not required to give up membership in the Federal House. The most outstanding case of that nature in recent times was the case of Dr. Manion who had been a Minister in the Government of Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen and who was still a member of the House of Commons while holding a position with the Province of Ontario, drawing down a considerable salary as a Commissioner of the Liquor Board of that Province.

So, when Mr. Scott assumed a position with the Federal Government as Inspector of Taxation, it was not necessary that he should have resigned his seat. But the Liberal party, expressing its views through the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government, and those views being agreed to by the member for Arm River himself, took the position that in cases of this kind, where a member of this Legislature is asked by the Federal Government to take a salary for a position which would require all his time, it would be proper for the member to resign in order to give all his time to that position. For that reason, Mr. Scott resigned and the seat was declared vacant.

It was not necessary, for another reason, that there should have been a by-election in Arm River. We, as every member realises, were drawing nearer and nearer to the end of the term of this Legislature to which we were elected in the year 1925. It is generally the custom of most of the Provinces to hold an election sometime during the fifth year of the Legislature; that is, sometime between the fourth year after the Provincial election and the fifth year, where the legal term is five years. Therefore, in all probability, sometime in the near future—though not so soon as some have prophesied—there will be an appeal to the Province of Saskatchewan and there could not have been any more than two Sessions go by without the constituency being represented in the House had there been no by-election held.

It was not necessary, so far as the Government is concerned in order to retain a majority in the House for us to have an election in Arm River. That will be obvious to everyone in the House, and even to the leader of the Conservative party, (*Mr. Anderson*). We could have conducted the affairs of this Legislature during the present Session and the next (if there is one) without any difficulty at all in securing a sufficient majority to carry the different matters of legislation which are to be proposed to the House. But, in spite of that fact the Government of this Province did not hesitate to call upon the people of Arm River to elect another representative to sit in the place of Mr. Scott, in order to take part in the passing of legislation in the interest of all the people of this Province as well as that of the constituency of Arm River.♦

Type of Campaign Waged

There has been something said, tonight and this afternoon, with regard to the contest that did take place in Arm River and before I have finished with what I have to say, I intend to deal somewhat fully with the remarks made. I have considered the remarks I have to make very carefully since listening to the members (to the leader of the Progressive party in this House (*Mr. Tran*) and the leader of the Conservative Party (*Mr. Anderson*)), as to whether or not it would be wise for me to go into any detail in connection with that by-election. Had either one of them stated, during the time they were addressing this House, that they were through with that type of campaign which was carried on there and during the past six months, I think I would have hesitated to the extent of not making any remarks at all about the Arm River by-election. But the remarks of the honourable gentlemen have convinced me that there is no intention on their part of doing anything different from what they have done during the time previous to this Session, in the way of attacks upon this Government.

As a matter of fact, some of the questions on the Order Paper would indicate that the same plan of campaign which was started in the Legislature at last Session and continued through the summer, is going to be pursued after the present Session is over. At the very first opportunity for questions to be put, there were questions asked of the same type as were printed on large sheets and spread throughout Arm River. This year, no doubt, there is the intention of again distributing these sheets with the answers upon them if, and when an election is brought on.

Something has been said with regard to personalities. Well, if I were to go back over the speeches delivered by the Conservative leader beginning with his first address of the Arm River Campaign, or better still, his address at his first meeting in the village of Dubuc, last spring, and review all his speeches down to the end of the Arm River by-election, and if I were to give the personal references that were dealt with by him, I would be addressing this House for a week. Just to indicate the extent to which this kind of campaign has been carried on in the Province of Saskatchewan, before I have finished my remarks, I am going to deal with sufficient numbers of personal references with regard to the members of this side and more particularly with regard to members of the Government. I will do this, I say, to indicate to every other member of the House that there has been a campaign of personal attack carried on throughout this Province during the greater part of the last six months and that that campaign is only being discontinued in order to lull into sleep members of this side of the House, until such time as the Opposition get out to the country again. Then all these statements with regard to Happyland, all these statements with regard to members on this side of the House, all these statements with regard to campaign funds, all these statements with regard to civil servants, will be carried up and down the country for the purpose of influencing the vote of the people of this Province—statements which I will show you as being absolutely false.

At this hour of the night it is not my intention to go at any length into these matters. I am going to ask leave to adjourn this debate at this time, to carry on at the next sitting of the House.

The Opposition Amendment

Continuing the debate on Friday, December 7, 1928, the Honourable Mr. Gardiner said:

Mr. Speaker,—The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Anderson*) to the Address reads as follows:

“But we regret that there is no expressed desire or intention to deal with the question of stricter enforcement of the present liquor laws in the Province; to introduce remedial legislation for the purpose of clearing up troublesome and difficult situations in regard to the administration of our public schools; to encourage and foster a definite provincial immi-

gration policy; to encourage the development of a wider provincial and foreign market for our immense lignite coal deposits, giving the assurance of a more extensive use of our own coal in Government institutions; to introduce a measure of Civil Service reform leading to the establishment of a Civil Service Commission, which shall be non-partisan; and to bring into effect reforms with reference to the administration of the office of the Official Guardian with a view to effecting greater economy."

I intend, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the remarks which I have to make to ask this House to vote down this amendment for the following reasons:

Dealing with the first matter it is proposed to add to the Speech from the Throne: "But we regret that there is no expressed desire or intention to deal with the question of stricter enforcement of the present liquor laws of the Province." I wish to state that the Government of this Province believes that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who have been entrusted with the duty of enforcing all the laws of the Province, including the liquor law, are quite competent to deal with this law and to enforce it in the best manner possible. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police carried out the policing of this Province from 1905 to 1917 and during that entire period there was at no time any insinuation, charge or inference that this force would not properly enforce the laws of the Province of Saskatchewan. Because of conditions which arose during the War period necessitating the changing of the Mounted Police into a military force, the policing of this Province was done by a force organised under the Attorney General's Department, known as the Saskatchewan Provincial Police.

In the year 1927, it was decided by the Government of the Province that it was in the best interest of all concerned to bring the enforcement of the law in this Province under the administration of the Mounted Police. We made representations to the Federal Government and, as result of the negotiations that took place, it was finally agreed to place the enforcement of all law in this Province under the Mounted Police. That has been done and under the arrangements agreed to, as stated to the members at last Session, the enforcement has been taken over by the Mounted Police and we are told that they are now organising a special squad for the enforcement of the liquor laws which will satisfy at least the majority of the people of this Province.

The Subject of Education

The second part of the amendment is this: "To introduce remedial legislation for the purpose of clearing up troublesome and difficult situations in regard to the administration of our public schools." Well, of course, it is very difficult to know what the leader of the opposition had in mind when he used those words. I wish to review the last six months in this Province to determine what was definitely in his mind at the time the suggestion was made.

Remedial legislation has a peculiar meaning in this country. Does the teaching of religion require remedial legislation in our Province? No doubt the matter which the opposition had in mind was to bring before the people of this Province a suggestion that, if they were in power in this Province, they would do something different from what the present Government is doing in connection with the teaching of religion.

Unfortunately for the Opposition, since the last Session of the House there was a Conservative convention held in the City of Saskatoon. I am reminded that, on that occasion, the leader of the Progressive party (*Mr. Tran*) sent a telegram to the convention which was being held in the City of Saskatoon in which he agreed to the fullest possible co-operation with his Conservative friends in this regard. At the same convention, a gentleman who has been going about the Province talking on education and who was particularly active in Arm River, (*Mr. J. F. Bryant* of the City of Regina), was chairman of the Resolutions Committee and, as chairman, I presume he had a good deal to do with what was proposed by the Resolutions Committee to the main convention being held. At any rate he is the only person who is officially in a position to state definitely what discussions took place in the Resolutions Committee and by what means they arrived at the conclusion that was handed down to the Convention. But we have the result of the considerations that were carried on, in the report made to the convention by the Resolutions Committee, in this Section of the Conservative platform having to do with Education:

"Believing that our present educational system is too indefinite, is in many respects obsolete and out-of-date and has not kept pace, etc., the Conservative Party pledges itself to revise the whole educational system with a view to providing as far as possible—" and then they go on to enumerate, and under clause "F", they state this:

"The Conservative Party pledges itself as far as possible; 'F, to prohibit the use of any religious emblem in the public schools where there are mixed denominations and to prohibit the holding of school in buildings used for religious purposes, except temporarily.'"

I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that is the only section in the platform of the Conservative party dealing with emblems in our schools, with the teaching of certain individuals in the schools or having anything to do with the religious aspect.

What does the section mean? Let us read the section again: "To prohibit the use of any religious emblem"; if it stopped there it would be perfectly clear that after this section had been converted into legislation, in no school in Saskatchewan would there be permitted any emblems

having to do with religion. But they do not stop there. They go on to say: "Where there are pupils or ratepayers of mixed religious denominations and to prohibit the holding of public schools in buildings used for religious purposes except temporarily."

I wish to state that the section of the Conservative platform dealing with emblems and teachers in the schools and having to do with the buildings themselves, is in conformity with the practice of our Department of Education from 1905 to the present time.

Mr. Anderson: No, No!

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: "No!" my friend says. I will prove it. I would like to ask you this: How are you going to legislate to bring this into effect? Are you going to say that you would go over this Province and separate all our schools whether public or separate, under two groups? It certainly could not be done by law, and anyone reading this section carefully will admit that what it asks for cannot be done by law. The only way the spirit of that resolution can be carried out is not by legislation, but by regulation through local school boards all over the Province, and the Department is seeing to it that the spirit of that particular section is carried out. That is exactly what the Department of Education has been doing from 1905 to the present time.

Similar Situation in Ontario

Saskatchewan is not the only Province that believes that cannot be done by law. I have here in my hand a report taken from two Ontario newspapers of a case in that Province and it is being dealt with by no less a person than Hon. Howard Ferguson, Minister of Education and at the same time leader of the Conservative Government in the Province of Ontario. What is the question before him? Well, it is the same old question as we have in the Province of Saskatchewan, having to do with children in a school in the district of Sandwich in the Province of Ontario. This is a news item dated November 29, 1928, from Windsor:

"An absolute denial that the Roman Catholic catechism had ever been taught during school hours was made today by Miss Edna Murphy, the Catholic teacher of S.D. No. 6, Sandwich East, where a religious controversy is now raging. The majority of pupils at the school are Catholic, although it is not a separate school, and Miss Murphy does not deny that she did teach the catechism, but flatly says that she never did so during school hours, the teaching being confined to recess and to lunch hours, Miss Murphy claimed. She admitted, however, that some of the pupils might have studied their catechism at their desks in school hours, while they had a few minutes of spare time, and she claims that Inspector Thomas Preston was fully cognizant of the fact that she taught the catechism, although she says she told him she never used school time for that purpose.

"As for pictures which the Inspector ordered removed when Mrs. Violet Coombe, a Protestant, who has a small boy in the school, complained that there were pictures having a distinct Catholic meaning on the walls of the school, Miss Murphy denied that they were Catholic.

"Mrs. Coombe denies this. She claims that the pictures were of the Sacred Heart, the Virgin Mary and Christ, and there was also a crucifix on the wall. The latter statement, however, is denied by the teacher.

"Means taken by the School Board to quiet the fuss have been anything but successful. At the request of the board, Armand Racine of the firm of McTague, Clark & Racine, township solicitors, wrote to Mrs. Coombe and several other women, telling them to discontinue persistent visits to the school. These the women deny. Mrs. Coombe in particular says she was there but twice, once in September to take her little boy to the school, and once later when she went there with Inspector Preston to see about the pictures on the wall which the Inspector later ordered removed.

"Among the accusations made by Mrs. Coombe against the conduct of the school was that her little boy was forced to do obeisance to a Catholic priest by way of saluting him when he visited the school; that he was obliged to study the Catholic catechism, and that he had been obliged to repeat prayers in French.

"Miss Murphy says that French and English prayers are used, the prayer in question being the Lord's Prayer, and the English version the one authorised by the Department of Education."

Premier Ferguson's Attitude

I may state that, in the regulations of the Department of Education in Ontario, it is definitely stated that religious emblems are not to be placed upon the walls in public schools. This is a public school and the claim is that the crucifix was there and that religious pictures were upon the wall. The important thing about the whole matter is this. When Mr. Ferguson was asked his opinion with regard to it he stated this:

"There will be no action taken by the Provincial Board of Education in respect of the two religious pictures, said to be Roman Catholic in character, displayed in Public School Section No. 6, Sandwich East, Premier Ferguson stated yesterday. It was a purely local matter, he declared, and action had already been taken by the School Inspector."

It was "purely a local matter" to be dealt with by the school board of that district!

Now, there is a distinction as between the type of separate school which they have and the type of separate school we have in this Province, and I believe a regulation such as they have in Ontario would not satisfy the people of Saskatchewan and does not satisfy the conditions which exist in our schools.

The practice of the Department has been from 1905 to now, to investigate wherever a charge is made by anybody complaining about the activities of the school board having to do with religious matters, with the placing of nuns in the schools or with the placing of the crucifix on the walls of the school. An investigation is first carried on to find out whether or not the school board is complying with the laws and the regulations governing the conduct of schools within this Province, whether they are separate or public schools. When they have satisfied themselves on that point, the investigation is carried further, to determine whether the spirit of the law is being carried out so as to get the best possible results in that district from the standpoint of the children in the school. If after careful enquiry into the whole matter it is found that the crucifix has been hung on the walls or that nuns have been engaged the school inspector goes into the district and if he finds the matters complained of interfering with the conduct of the school, the inspector then uses his best services in order to see that the source of irritation is removed. In nine cases out of ten—I will say in 999 cases out of 1,000—our school inspectors have been successful in seeing that no further disputes over this matter come up. Inside of a few weeks' time the matter is settled to the satisfaction of the people in the district, and there is seldom further trouble. I submit, therefore, it is advisable to do by law or regulation some of the things which are being suggested by members of the opposition. We are in the position in this Province today where we have less controversy in the local districts of our Province on these matters than any Province in the Dominion with the possible exception of the Province of Alberta, and to be in a position to state to the opposition that as large a percentage of our children are playing on a common schoolground as anywhere else in Canada. In answer to some of the remarks made yesterday, I would state that not one half of one per cent. of the children of the Province are in parochial or private schools.

Conditions in Ontario and the Maritimes

Mr. Anderson: It has been stated that all the attempts have been made to satisfy the majority. Has any attempt been made to satisfy the minority?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: I will indicate in two very different cases in this Province just what efforts have been made to satisfy the minority and I think I will be able to prove that we have done so.

I was stating that less than half of one per cent. of the children of this Province are in parochial or private schools, and I can state, further, that less than two per cent. of the school population of Saskatchewan is attending separate, parochial and private schools combined—a total of slightly over 4,000 out of the 220,000 pupils in the whole Province, attending in all three types of school.

What are the conditions in the old Province of Ontario? In the old Province of Ontario they have 716 separate schools and they are separate in every sense of the term—separate in this way, that when a public school inspector is appointed he is appointed by the County Council and when he is appointed to examine separate schools he is appointed by the Government. When he is appointed to inspect public schools, one third of his salary is paid by the County Council. When he is appointed as a separate school inspector his salary is paid by the Government. When the French language is taught in the schools, the school is not inspected by the ordinary inspector but by two inspectors, one being English-speaking and the other French, and these two inspectors actually count heads in the school to decide and determine as to how much of the time is to be given in that school for the teaching of French and how much for the teaching of the English language. We have nothing like that in this Province. When you begin to speak of remedial legislation to correct conditions existing in this Province it is well to remember that we already have the most acceptable conditions existing in any province.

I might review the Maritime Provinces, from which many of the people of this Province come. What are the conditions down there? Go into the City of Halifax and you will find school after school with the cross upon it, and when you ask the Superintendent of Schools in that Province whether or not that is a private school, he will tell you it is a public school. I was down there last summer and asked the Superintendent that question and he said: "This is a public school." I asked him who built the school, and he said, "The Roman Catholic Church built it." I said: "Who is operating it?" He said, "The school board of the City of Halifax."

I asked: "Who are the teachers in those schools?" and he said, "Some of them are lay teachers, some nuns, and some brothers." I said, "Are they all qualified to teach school through the Government institutions of the Province?" He said, "No." I asked: "What percentage of the teachers in the province are fully qualified by taking a regular course of instruction in a provincial institution?", and he said "About forty-two per cent.". Well, I said to him: "Not all are properly qualified who are teaching in these schools?" He said, "Quite a number of those are qualified, but a number of them have not been trained in the State institutions of the Province of Nova Scotia." Then I said: "You have no separate schools here. Have you had any trouble

in these matters?" He answered: "No, we have never had any trouble." He said it was a condition laid down at Confederation, expressed time after time by Joseph Howe, that the schools in the Province of Nova Scotia would be under the control of the local school boards to the extent which they are out in the Acadian settlements. The French people in the Acadian settlements decide what teacher they will have. The Scotch people over in Pictou decide what teacher they will have teaching their sons and daughters, and he said, because of that, these people get along very well. I said, "Why is that?" He said, "Because the divisions are more or less clearly defined. You can travel along the old Annapolis Valley and in one section of it you will find the Acadian settlement well defined while in another you will find the descendants of the U. E. Loyalist stock, each living by themselves and controlling their own school matters."

Another thing I found in the Maritime Provinces was that in the first four grades in the schools when the school board so decides, the French language is the language of instruction and that one hour is given to English. This is a possibility and actually carried out in many cases. Then I found, in addition, that in the last four grades, the English language is the language of instruction with one hour for French. It is a very different condition from what we have in Saskatchewan, under our law which our friends by "remedial legislation" want to change. Well, I do not think it is necessary that I should go into further detail to prove the strong position already held by Saskatchewan.

Mr. Anderson: Is it the idea of the Premier that this system is to be introduced in this Province?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I am telling you what the actual conditions are in different parts of the Dominion of Canada in order to illustrate to the opposition that we have the best system of schools in the Province of Saskatchewan that can be found in the Dominion of Canada. I am going to tell him that leading men in the House of Commons who opposed the introduction of the Autonomy Bill in 1905 and took a very strong stand in connection with the type of legislation which was introduced in this Province and in the Province of Alberta, are willing to admit to-day that we have the best school law with respect to the teaching of language or religion that can be found in any province of the Dominion of Canada.

Parochial Schools in the United States

Not only have we a law outstanding in the Dominion but we have a school law in this Province that will stand the test of comparison with school laws of the United States. I had the good fortune to attend a public school there. I am proud to state that I attended public school in the United States. I received, as a matter of fact, the greater part of my education in the great republic to the South and when this discussion started in Saskatchewan advocating National Schools I was able to allow my mind to run back to the different States in which I had lived and to compare the conditions there with the conditions that exist here. Now, in one of the towns which happened to be a lumbering town in Michigan where I lived, there was a German Catholic school, a French Catholic school, an Irish Catholic school and a Polish Catholic school.

Mr. Anderson: What about the Scotch?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Possibly there was a Scotch, too, but they might have attended with the Irish. All these different types of school were not supported, it is true, from the taxes that were raised, but the important fact to my mind is that, in the Province of Saskatchewan, but two per cent. of our children are being educated in schools other than our public schools, and of that two per cent. no more than one half of one per cent. are being taught in parochial schools while the others are being taught in minority schools which are under the same law and regulations as our public schools.

I was somewhat interested in these reminiscences. I went down to the United States and visited the old states—the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts, and when I was sitting in the office of the Superintendent of Education in the City of Boston, I put this question: "How many parochial schools have you in the City of Boston; have you very many?" He said: "I could not tell you, but there is one thing I can tell you and that is that there are 89,000 children in the City of Boston being educated in private and parochial schools." I said, "How many are being educated in the public schools?" and he said, "107,000", and if you figure that out you will find that 45 per cent. of the children in Boston are being educated in Roman Catholic parochial schools. You will find, also, 18 per cent. of all children in the State of Massachusetts are being educated in parochial schools and in the Province of Ontario that 95,000 are being educated in the 716 separate schools and the private and parochial schools of that Province.

In comparison with that you have, in this Province, over 97 per cent., almost 98 per cent., of our children being educated in our common public schools, playing on the common playground and learning the one language, the same ideals and customs. I say our system will compare in the matter of religious instruction and language, law and regulation, with any school system on the North American Continent.

For that reason I would ask you to vote down that section which has to do with the amendment to the Speech from the Throne by the introduction of this clause: "That there is no remedial legislation for the purpose of clearing up troublesome and difficult situations in regard to the administration of our public schools."

The Gouverneur Case

I said, a few minutes ago, that I was going to deal with a few specific cases that my honourable friend had in mind,—I think the same cases as he referred to, day after day, in Arm River, cases having to do with the school in Wakaw and the school in Gouverneur. These, after all, are the only two cases in the Province of Saskatchewan from which there has been coming any considerable amount of controversy with regard to religious teaching in the school and the greater part of the controversy in respect to Gouverneur school came during the sitting of this Legislature, last January. I think it was on the 23rd of January, last, that I received a telegram indicating to me that if we did not see that the crucifix was down by the 26th day of January, all the Protestant children would be taken out of the school. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the House in session and with the City of Regina situated some little distance from the hamlet of Gouverneur, in the middle of winter it is a rather big order to get down there and settle a question like that and do it in three days. But we had to do the best we could. We had Inspector Jean go down there. We wired down that he was coming and had them withhold action until he reached there. He took the matter up with the school board and the teacher, and got them to agree to take down the crucifix. When he arrived back in Regina, he reported the matter to me and I said: "That is quite satisfactory." Inside a day or two, however, I had another message from Gouverneur wanting to know when this crucifix was going to be taken down. We sent them word that we understood it had been done. Now I am going to follow quite closely here the record of the Department, because there has been considerable discussion with regard to this matter.

On January 27th, Mr. Jean visited the school and reported that the Board had given instructions to the teachers, in his presence, that in future no religious emblem should appear on the walls of the school. The teacher and the board assured Mr. Jean that the provisions of *The School Act* were being complied with regarding the teaching of French. On January 31st, Mr. Frank Jackson wired the Department that the crucifix was still being placed daily in the school by the teacher and again, on February 2nd, he wired to the same effect, adding that conditions were exactly as they had been before the matter had been brought to the attention of the Department. On February 7th, we received a letter signed by three trustees, suggesting that the dissension was caused by one or two trouble-makers, and requesting advice as to whether the placing of a crucifix in the school was sufficient reason for parents to keep their children away from school. The Department replied on February 9th that the Minister did not intend to give instructions one way or the other but requesting the trustees to give the matter of removing the crucifix their earnest consideration, in order that the school might be operated at its maximum efficiency. That was the effort we were making to see that the minority should get the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. Anderson: Not a very strong effort.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: You will see how strong the effort was before I am through. On the same date on which the Department wrote to the trustees, a letter to the same effect was written to Mr. Jackson, with the suggestion that, as the Department was not in a position to interpret the law it might be advisable for the complainant to seek legal advice with respect to the action of the board.

On February 9th, the trustees wrote the Department referring to a Mgr.—to whom, it was stated, an answer had been given officially stating that it was lawful for a school commission to install crucifixes in class rooms, and also suggesting that the Ku Klux Klan was creating the discord in the district. On February 13th, Mr. Jackson sent us a lengthy telegram advising that six children had been withdrawn from school for nearly two weeks and that the remaining Protestant children were being taken out that day, making a total of 15, and that they would not return until the crucifix was removed.

The action of the trustees in having the crucifix at the school was brought to the attention of the Provincial Police by James H. Chapman, of Gouverneur, in a letter dated February 22, but the file does not disclose that any steps were taken by the Police in the matter. A copy of a Crime Report of the Provincial Police, dated March 7, 1928, however, gives what purports to be an account of the hearing before a Justice of the Peace, on charges under Section 21 of *The School Attendance Act*, laid by the Truant Officer of the school district, against five persons. The J.P. dismissed the charges without costs. The report of the School Inspector, dated September 22, 1927, gave 31 present out of an enrolment of 41, while the inspector's report of April 24, 1928, shows 38 present out of an enrolment of 45. Previous to March 16th, the district was visited by a representative of myself as Minister. The crucifix was removed and the children returned to school, accounting for the fact the attendance was greater on the second than the first date. In addition, on March 16th, Mr. Ball, acting on my instructions, telephoned the chairman of the board with respect to the use of the crucifix in the school. The board was holding a meeting and proposed that the Protestant children should return to the school and that the crucifix should remain in the school for two or three days, after which it would be removed. When this was reported to me, I declined to accede to the proposal and I instructed Mr. Ball to telephone the board again advising them of this. Finally, the Board undertook to remove the crucifix immediately so that the Protestant children should have no further reason to absent themselves from school. This was on a Saturday, and the Protestant children were back in the school on the Monday morning.

Tory Misrepresentations

Now it is necessary that this matter should be followed still more closely in order to show what has been said in the Province with regard to it, and what action had previously been taken by the Government. I am reading now from an article which appeared in one of the newspapers, the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*—No! I will take it from *The Regina Daily Star*, which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is “Regina’s Independent Newspaper.” This is the account, “Exclusive to The Star,” of what was told in one of the little schoolhouses in the constituency of Arm River, by no less a personage than Mr. Bryant himself. In this article he says this:

“An insidious programme for French and Roman Catholic political control is going on quietly but surely in Saskatchewan and the people are kept in ignorance of the true situation by the Government and the press. For a temporary political advantage, the Saskatchewan Government has sacrificed the future of this Province and has sown seeds which will bear fruit in discord and strife in generations yet unborn. They have considered the success of the Liberal party of more importance than the future of the Province.

“Now French alone has the official sanction. It may be used as a language of instruction in the first grade in case of French speaking pupils—It may be used as a subject for a period of one hour when authorised by resolution of the school board—In many districts, the Roman Catholic French trustees have a French teacher and French is used as a language of instruction in all the grades in spite of the protests of the English and other nationalities in the district.

“The French people keep on agitating for equality of language rights in Saskatchewan, believing that the persistence of the agitation will wear down opposition and each concession weakly granted by the Government becomes a starting point for further encroachments.”

No misrepresentation in the Arm River by-election, no insinuations were made! Listen!

“Bilingualism is fostered and encouraged by the Government. The French in Saskatchewan are claiming certain rights to the use of their language under the British North America Act. No such right exists in Saskatchewan. Canada is not bilingual. Quebec alone is bilingual under the Act. No other province other than Quebec can become bilingual except by the Act of its Government.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to state in reply to that is: If there is any member of the Opposition or any Conservative candidate, including Mr. J. F. Bryant, who can bring to the attention of the Government one single instance in which the Department of Education has permitted the teaching of French or any other language outside of the law of this Province, I will place him in the position, by opening a constituency in this province, to contest that constituency on the issue which he raises. Then he goes on to say:

“The Government has permitted the use of French in the schools. They have authorized the use of the French text books used in the Parochial schools of Quebec for the teaching of religion to the members of their faith. These books were used for years. Then de-authorized on account of protests, again re-authorized because a comparatively few people were protesting and again withdrawn in the face of a storm of indignation as the facts leaked out.”

Now, the leader of the opposition knows better than that. Mr. J. F. Bryant knows better than that. These books were not re-authorized as a result of any protest. These books never were re-authorized in full at any time, but only to the end of the term, with certain sections deleted. Both these gentlemen knew that because I have stated it in their presence on several occasions.

“The Government has appointed French school inspectors to inspect the French schools.”

A statement that is absolutely false and contrary to any records that can be found in this Province. No inspectors of any nationality have been appointed by the Government to inspect French schools.

“Take the Gouverneur school district No. 4557 of Saskatchewan to see how the regulations work out. The French Catholics are in majority and the trustees are all French Catholics—a French teacher was hired—French was used as a language of instruction at times in all the grades. It was taught one hour each day. The Catholic religion was taught one-half hour. The English speaking pupils, 13 in number, lost one and one-half hours of instruction each day,”

which, of course, they should not do according to the law and regulations of this province.

“At the suggestion of the Inspector, Father Auclair, a crucifix was put in the front of the school near the blackboard and the flag which was originally there, was put on the back wall.”

In connection with that statement, Mr. Speaker, let me say that Father Auclair never has been an inspector of schools in this Province and is not now.

“I heard Premier Gardiner misrepresenting the situation to the Conference of the United Church of Canada in Regina. He claimed that the Government had used its good offices to have the crucifix removed, that it was removed, the children were back to school, and all was peacefully settled. Premier Gardiner, as Minister of Education, had the power to remove the crucifix and he refused to act.

"The statement made by Premier Gardiner to the ministers of the United Church of Canada was quite different to the statement made by him at Dysart and Cupar a few days before. He is reported to have said at Lipton that he knew the crucifix was being displayed in the schools and, so far as he was concerned, it could stay there as he did not intend to take any steps to have it removed."

I have never at any time, at Dysart, Cupar or anywhere else, made any such statement. If I was so reported, then I can only say with my friends of the Opposition, that I am sometimes misquoted.

Mr. Bryant went on in that campaign and elsewhere to claim that it was as a result of an injunction that he took out, that the crucifix was removed. I have here all the legal documents in connection with that injunction. Do you know when it was started? It was started on the twentieth day of March and the crucifix was down three days before that action was even started.

No misrepresentation, no insinuations in Arm River?

The Wakaw Case

With regard to the Wakaw case, it is still being dealt with by the Department and when the conclusion of the negotiations is reached there, the result will be as satisfactory to the people of Wakaw and to the people of the whole Province, as was the solution in the Hamlet of Gouverneur. I would say more with regard to it were it not for the fact that the discussion of this matter, either inside or outside the House, while the negotiations are being carried on, is very likely to create misunderstandings in the district. I believe, by the spring of this year, there will not be a single case, under the provisions we have in this Province for dealing with the teaching of religion or language, that our friends of the opposition will be able to hold up as an example of the troubles that arise under the school law of this Province. (*The Wakaw Separate School has since been dis-organized and an agreement reached.*)

The next matter that is dealt with in this amendment has to do with "encouraging and fostering a definite provincial immigration policy."

We on this side of the House have always taken the position since 1905, that immigration was a matter that should be looked after by the Federal Government through its Department of Immigration, so long as the natural resources of the Province are under the control of the Federal Government. That policy has been continued down to the present time. We are hopeful that, in the very near future, the unalienated resources will be returned to this Province for administration and when that time comes, we will be prepared to establish as active an immigration policy as any Saskatchewan Government could have. I may say that no Provincial Government can have full control over the ports of entry at Vancouver, Halifax or the Port of Montreal through which comes the greater number of the immigrants from overseas. The Federal Government can and does control entry at these ports, but once the immigrants have entered Canada we cannot prevent them from passing our borders whether on the Manitoba side or the Alberta side, and for that reason, for all time to come, it will be necessary for the Federal Government to exercise control over immigration.

Development of Saskatchewan Coal Resources

The next point in the amendment has to do with coal: "To encourage the development of a wider provincial and foreign market for our immense lignite coal deposits, giving the assurance of a more extensive use of our coal in Government institutions."

The Government has had a very definite policy on this matter for many years. It has been recognised by everyone who knows the nature of the coal that is taken from the mines in the southern part of the Province, that about 35 per cent. of the coal is water. So, in shipping coal with that percentage of moisture you are placing the person who is going to use it at a disadvantage in the burning of it, as compared with others using other coals on the market.

We have been attempting in this Province, in the first instance with the assistance of the Federal and Manitoba Governments, and latterly alone, to devise a scheme whereby the water and other elements not necessary in a first class coal, can be dispensed with, and briquettes made of that coal which it would be possible to place upon the market at a price to compete with Alberta coal. We are glad to be able to report that, during the present week, the endeavour on the part of this Government has eventually met with success. After Christmas, British capitalists who have invested \$600,000 (half of that capital being obtained from British Isles) in remodelling and equipping the plant at Bienfait, completed erection of their plant, and are now in a position to proceed to produce briquettes at the plant at the end of this year. At first the briquettes will be produced at the rate of 100 tons a day, and it is probable that the output will be increased to 200 tons a day, within a month. In other words, there will be produced from the time the plant starts and the Spring, somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 tons of briquettes at the mine-mouth at Bienfait. We have entered or are entering, into an arrangement with the Company whereby the Government will take the entire production of the plant in the initial stages, and will consume the same at the different heating plants of Government buildings in the Province. That arrangement has been, more or less, completed with representatives of the Company. The thing we emphasised and that weighed with us most was that it is in the interests of the

people of this Province to have this industry established, and that it is a very important thing not only for the Province of Saskatchewan but for the whole of Canada, that we should encourage British capital to come here and have British capitalists satisfied with their investments here.

When the proposition was made to us that these people were prepared to expend \$600,000 on the Bienfait plant to fit it for the manufacture of this product, we stated to the Company that, on the day that expenditure was completed, we would turn over the Bienfait plant to them at an initial price of one dollar—the same price, by the way, that some of those farms were sold for. But this is not only the initial price. This is to be the final price for, if they turn out from the Bienfait plant 100 tons a day for twelve months, they are to get the entire result of the expenditure made on the plant by the Federal, Manitoba and Saskatchewan Governments, without further cost.

Now that they have fulfilled their part of the contract and expended that money on the plant, the Government has undertaken to take the entire output of the plant for consumption in the public institutions in the Province until such time as they have established themselves in such a way as to warrant their putting those products upon the general market. That is the effort we have put forth not only to see that Saskatchewan coal is used in the different public buildings, but also to see to it that Saskatchewan coal can be readily used for commercial purposes and in the homes all over the Province. For that reason, I am going to ask the House to vote down this amendment in that particular.

Saskatchewan's Civil Service Administration Commended

Then he (*Mr. Anderson*) is going to introduce a measure of Civil Service Reform. I am going to content myself with reading to the House a letter which was written to me, unsolicited, by no less a personage than Mr. Fred Telford, whom anyone who knows anything about civil service knows, is perhaps the greatest authority on Civil Service organisation on this Continent. He is an authority who works under the organisation in the United States, known as the Bureau of Public Administration, Mills Building, Washington, D.C. In his letter dated October 5, 1928, he writes as follows:

"I have recently returned from an extensive trip I made in order to visit the various civil service commissioners in the western part of Canada and the United States and to attend the meeting of the Assembly of Civil Service Commissions which was held in Denver early in September. I had the privilege of spending one day in Regina and talking over matters of mutual interest with Mr. P. G. Ward, your own civil service commissioner. I formed a very favourable impression of the work Mr. Ward is doing and while I have no doubt that you appreciate his efforts more than it is possible for an outsider like me, yet I feel impelled to write you briefly, setting forth some of my own observations and conclusions.

"In a service as large and as geographically scattered as the Province of Saskatchewan, it is always necessary in order to bring about anything like uniform and equitable treatment of the employees and in order to see that the considerable sums of money contributed by the tax payers for the payment of the salaries of public servants is well spent to have some form of central control. It seemed to me from my observation that this control in the Province of Saskatchewan is being exercised with considerable discretion. You have your positions classified and a salary scale for each kind of work which are the first steps in any intelligent attack on the personnel problem in a public or private organisation. You pay less attention to the formal selection of employees than is common in some of the British Dominions and in the United States, but at the same time you are taking steps to assure the employment of the right kind of persons. I was particularly interested in the work being done to fix the hours of work, to regulate salary adjustments, to control the size of the civil establishment, and to provide for such working conditions that the employees can do their work effectively. Mr. Ward displayed a considerable interest in service or efficiency ratings in order to get some fairly accurate estimate of the methods by which the various employees are performing their work on the job and we spent some time in going over the difficulties involved in work of this sort. I was much interested, too, in the retirement system which has been installed; this is a subject in which I am much interested and regarding which I am not well informed and the opportunity to learn about the work being done in Saskatchewan was to me most illuminating.

"I was astonished to note the low cost at which this administrative control over personnel problems and work is being done. It seems to me you are getting a large return for the money being spent in this fashion and that you would fare still better if you spent still more. In particular, it seems to me that you would be justified in increasing your expenditures somewhat for the purpose of doing more intensive work in the recruiting of your personnel and in working out and installing a system of service or efficiency ratings so as to tell better than is possible at present how well the persons selected are performing on the job.

"I should like to repeat that I am writing this letter with some diffidence but at the same time with the feeling that perhaps you would like to have a brief account of the observations and conclusions of an outsider, who for the best part of one day was given every opportunity by Mr. Ward to observe the work being done. The day to me was both interesting and

profitable and I cannot forbear from expressing to you my appreciation not only of the courtesy shown me but my feeling that the Civil Service Commissioner's work is of such character that you may well feel proud of it."

Now, an ordinary person would not learn very much about the administration in one day but an expert such as Mr. Telford is acknowledged to be, would learn more in one day than most persons would in a month. You will note that he was "astonished at the low cost of administrative control over personnel problems." In other words, we are not over-spending in this Department to get results, but, he said, we would get better results if we were to spend more money on it. Well, now, I think that, possibly, that gentleman is a better authority on civil service control than even the leader of the Conservative Party.

Finally, we are asked to add to the Speech from the Throne "to bring into effect reforms with reference to the administration of the office of the Official Guardian with a view to effecting greater economy." If the honourable gentleman has been reading the newspapers this last week he would have read that the matter was being considered by the Government and that the Attorney General, sometime during this Session, would discuss this matter.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the members on both sides of the House to vote down this amendment.

(Amendment voted upon and negatived upon a division).

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1928.

The Honourable Mr. Gardiner, continuing in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, said:

Mr. Speaker,—I feel quite confident that each and every member of the House will agree with me when I state that all members are pleased, this afternoon, to have on the floor of the House no less a personage than the man who sat as Prime Minister of the Province for four years of its political existence. We have learned to honour him in this House because of his ability as a member of the Government. We have also learned to honour him as the leader of the Government of the Province and, since he left us to perform further duties in the Dominion House and in the Federal Government, we have learned to know him as a man who represents Saskatchewan in a manner most acceptable to the great majority of the people of this Province. We are pleased at the same time to have with him two of the members of the Federal House who have represented their constituencies since 1925 and represented them well.

The occasion upon which we have met is one which has still within it considerable concern to the people of our Province because of the continued severe illness of the King which was referred to by all speakers in the earlier stages of this debate.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to refer further to the Mover (*Mr. McIntosh*) and Seconder (*Mr. Waugh*) of the Motion otherwise than to recall the fact that I had referred at the beginning of my address to the attitude assumed by both these men when presenting the motion now before the House, and in this connection I would refer to the speech of the Seconder—to certain remarks of his which have been objected to by the leader of the Conservative opposition in the House (*Mr. Anderson*) and upon which some comment has been made by the leader of the Progressive party (*Mr. Tran*) in the House.

I am going, for a few moments, to deal with some of the comments of the Progressive leader, the member for Pelly, who stated that a great deal of time is lost because of Party discussions having to do with matters which have taken place between sessions outside of the House and also having to do with matters merely because they are party matters.

Irregularities in Elections

I might state that the matters in the discussion referred to were not particularly party matters. That is, it is not a matter of party consideration at all that certain individuals throughout the length and breadth of Canada, at different times and different places, have committed misdemeanors in the conduct of elections which are not within the law of the Province concerned, or of the Dominion. These acts have been committed not only in Saskatchewan but outside of the Province of Saskatchewan as well. As a matter of fact there is never an election held, whether it be a by-election or a general election, in which there is not some claim made by either one side or the other, or by some party concerned, that somewhere the party winning the election has committed some act in the election which is not in conformity with the law governing elections in the Dominion of Canada.

The election which has just taken place in Saskatchewan is no exception to the rule, but in spite of all that was heard in the days immediately following the election, no action has been taken by the Conservative leader or his candidate to bring on a recount in the Constituency or to make any charges against any one of those concerned with the conduct of that particular election. But to get back to the point. This matter of the breaking of the election law is not a matter that is confined to any one political party in the Dominion of Canada. I could take you back over the entire history of the Dominion of Canada, right back to Confederation, and draw from the annals of all parties and recall to you incident after incident indicating the truth of the statement I have just made. I am not going to do that but I will refer to this:

Since the formation of the Province of Saskatchewan there have been three elections where the claims of the Opposition Party concerned have been taken either to the courts and have been decided upon, or have come before a committee of this House. One of those was in the very first election in Saskatchewan, in the northern part of the Province in the constituency of Prince Albert. I think there was a different name given to it then; however, it was west of Prince Albert, which I think went by the name of West Prince Albert, afterwards the constituency now known as Shellbrook. In connection with the conduct of that election it was maintained that certain men had voted who had no right to vote. The matter was tried and a conclusion was reached, and when the conclusion was reached the Government of the day under Hon. Walter Scott—which is unique in political history so far as this Province is concerned, and I think, also, so far as the Dominion is concerned—made it possible for the Opposition Candidate who had contested the election, without any further test taking place, to take his seat. As a result of that action, Mr. Donaldson became a member of this House and remained a member until the year 1917.

In addition to that, there have been two other cases. One of these cases had to do with another political party in the Province. It was stated the other day by the leader of the Conservative Party, that his party has no political past in this Province to be concerned about. Well, now, it just so happens that the member for North Qu'Appelle, who happens to be the leader of the Government at the present time, became a member as a result of the second election case. That case was brought on following the election of 1912. That election was contested in the courts and the candidate who was successful tendered his resignation, admitting, in doing so, that illegal practices had been indulged in by his party in the constituency of North Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Anderson: Not necessarily!

Premier Gardiner: Not necessarily, says my honourable friend, but he did it, and did it over his own signature, which, as a matter of fact, I have in my possession. Now I contested the election following that, and if I were going to argue in this House that because the Conservative party had perpetrated certain acts contrary to the election laws of this province therefore every Liberal candidate who runs in the future should be elected, and we could go around claiming that we were not acting upon suspicions when we so argue, but upon a proven case—then there should never be returned to this House in the future anybody but a Liberal candidate. But that is not sound argument. The people of North Qu'Appelle dealt with it in the by-election which was held, by returning the Liberal candidate to this House and, so far as the Liberal candidate and the people of Saskatchewan were concerned, the incident was a closed book to the people of this Province.

Then we had another case where a member of another party was brought before the courts in connection with an election which happened to be a Federal election. This time it was a member of the Federal House, a member of the Progressive Party, and he too was unseated as a result of the practices in the election which took place, and which brought the matter into the courts.

Well, now, I only indicate these cases to you to show that the guilt of breaking election laws cannot be confined to any one political party. As a matter of fact, the breaking of law is largely a matter of the human frailties of which we sometimes speak too lightly and of which, at other times, we make too much. I come back to the statement made in connection with a certain election in this province in the year 1925—a general election. You may say that that is not of very much concern to the people of this Province. You may say that the thing is gone by and we should forget it, and, I believe, as a result of the fact that the matter was not brought before the courts or a special committee of this House that there should be a great deal of attention given to that contention. Before we come to deal with the detail of the matter, I draw it to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have had incidents in different provinces of the Dominion under different party leadership that bear me out when I state that no party can claim unto itself all of the political manipulation nor can any party claim unto itself all of the political truthfulness and all the political legality of action in the conduct of elections in the Dominion as a whole or in the Province.

Party Discussions in the Legislature

As reported in the press today, the member for Pelly last night made the statement that too much of the time of this House was taken up by party discussion and that therefore we should have a change in the form of representation from that which we have in the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. In that connection I only wish to state that there is no House in the Dominion of Canada which takes less time in doing the business before the House than this Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan. The records of the other Legislatures will bear me out in that, and one of the reasons we take much less time is to be found in the method under which the discussions on the Address and the questions arising from it, have been carried on since this Assembly was first formed. It has been the practice in this House to clear away all contentious matters before we get down to the actual business of the House. In this House we have always made it the practice to deal definitely and specifically with any charges that have been made, with any charges that have arisen in connection with a by-election, with any charges that have been made in public addresses in the time intervening between two sessions when

members were not in a position to deal with and discuss the matter as it arose. Thus, at the end of the debate, we are in this position in this House that we can go on with the actual business of the House, having cleared out of the way all reason for any further controversy of that kind.

Believing that to be the proper procedure to follow, I intend to deal with some of the matters brought into the discussion the other day by the leader of the Opposition. I do not intend during the time I shall take in the House, to bring this debate down to any level for which I should be justly criticised by any either inside or outside of the House, but in order to justify my speaking to this House, I must give consideration to some of the criticisms of the Government and answer those accusations in a manner that cannot be misunderstood.

In the first place, I have before me an account of a speech delivered by the leader of the Conservative Party in this House the other day, as reported in "*The Regina Star*," Saskatchewan's Independent newspaper, and in that account I read this: "Let me tell this House and the member for Arm River that there were no misrepresentations, no insinuations, and no statements of untruth on our side in that campaign." That is one statement. Then it goes on:

"If any member of the Party I have the honour to lead was to circulate such slogans as the member has cited, I would be as strong as he in my condemnation. It is the first I ever heard of any such thing. I never saw nor heard any such statement as he asserts throughout the whole campaign in Arm River. Neither the member for Arm River nor any of his side of the House can point a finger at us and say that we are guilty or that they are innocent. I believe the honourable member to be a man of integrity and honour, but I know for a positive fact that men and women supporters of his in that election carried on a whispering campaign of scandal directed at our candidate and myself. I think the leader of the Government had better be prepared to get up and denounce such tactics on the part of the great machine he has built up around himself."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the introduction to remarks which I am going to deal with, but before dealing with those remarks, may I say that members on this side of the House who took part in that campaign in the country, spent a great deal of time in enunciating the policies of the Government of this Province, in stating to the people what the efforts of the Government have been, and were careful at all times not to state anything in connection with the private or public life of any person that cannot be substantiated by actual facts. In replying to the insinuation that some members of this Government should be more careful as to what they state, I wish to say that there is no member of this Government who has any reason to feel unnecessarily concerned about any stories which may be circulated, truthfully, in this Province either as to his public administration or with regard to his personal life.

Then comes this statement—reading from the same newspaper:

"Speakers, including the head of the Government have gone up and down the land trying to poison the minds of the people against me. But I throw the charges back in their teeth.

"The Premier, in denying the truth of charges I have made, has even said that they were false."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that some of them were false, and when I read them to the House this afternoon, I think members will agree that I had some reason for saying that some at least, of these statements were false.

Let me deal with this statement—It is from a report in the *Regina Leader* of October 9, 1928, of an address delivered by the leader of the Conservative Opposition:

"As head of the Government (and he is here quoting remarks made by myself)—As head of the Government it has been my effort to draw all of our people closer together and to follow the lead of those men who believe in unity and the building up of a spirit of Canadianism of which we can all be proud."

Then he goes on to comment on that statement. And what does he say, Mr. Speaker?

"These," said Dr. Anderson, "were the statements of a man who has done more to create racial and religious strife and discord throughout the length and breadth of Saskatchewan than any other single individual since 1905; these are the words of a man who got up in the Legislature at Regina and wildly struck out in every direction that would tend to encourage discord and strife; these are the words of a man who went up and down this Province for two long months, raving and ranting and frantically uttering wild and illogical statements that have caused thousands of thinking men and women to desert the party he leads."

Stereotype Tory Prophesies of Liberal Defeat

These are the words of the leader of the Opposition not only with regard to myself but they are a repetition of his remarks with regard to previous heads of the Government in this Province. I am beginning to wonder just why our friends of the Opposition take such an attitude—talking themselves out of existence by continuing to repeat that kind of thing. I can go back over the remarks made by certain members on the Opposition side of the House and more particularly the remarks of the leader of the Opposition himself, dealing with these particular matters. I

would remind myself of the fact that he has been prophesying the defeat of this Government ever since he became leader of the Conservative Party in 1924.

Listen to this. In an excerpt from the *Moose Jaw Times*, July 23, 1924, (a year before the election), under the heading "The Conservative Point of View," reference is made in an article "to changes in opinion that are becoming apparent among many of those who have for long been supporters of the Liberal administration at Regina."

Then speaking at Moose Jaw on October 15, 1924, Dr. Anderson expressed himself in these words:

"Many were flocking to the standard of the party; many who were supporters of the present administration. In the district through which the speaker had travelled a vast majority were opposed to the present Provincial administration. Many promises had been made and had not been kept, many pledges were not redeemed and the people had become disappointed."

And on February 27, 1925, in an address, and repeated again in "The Conservative Point of View" in the *Moose Jaw Times*, I find it stated by the leader of the Conservative party that at the next election a "great wave of opposition that is passing over the Province will, if given a few months longer, completely engulf the Government." And they have been prophesying that ever since 1924.

Mr. Anderson: It won't be long now!

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: It won't be long now! Here are his words at the time:

"Judging from present signs there is likely to be an early appeal. If an election is brought on before seeding it will be because the Government fear to wait longer. If they wait longer their chances of success will daily grow less hopeful. The great wave of opposition that is passing over the province will, if given a few months longer, completely engulf them."

Well, we gave them a few months longer and what happened? The result is here, Mr. Speaker. We see fifty-three members sitting on this side of the House and only four sitting in the centre group opposite—yes, only three were returned actually at that time, the fourth being elected later. Now we are getting these prophesies again as to what is going to happen in the Province of Saskatchewan and I only need say to my honourable friend that as long as he continues to make prophesies of that kind and we continue to benefit from them as we have, we will still be seated on this side of the House and will have no cause to complain.

My honourable friend has said there was no misrepresentation in connection with the campaign. Remarks were made, too, as to who was responsible for the feelings stirred up in this Province with regard to racial and religious questions. I want to give members of this House a sufficient number of illustrations to show where that kind of thing really originated.

Tories Responsible for Racial and Religious Campaign

Speaking at Melfort in May, 1924, as reported in the *Melfort Journal* of May 6th, Dr. Anderson referred in certain terms to the school system of the Province. I do not think I need quote the first part of the article which is to the effect that the leader of the Conservative party had taught school in that part of Saskatchewan situated between the present towns of Melville and Yorkton somewhere around 1908. In the school district where the honourable gentleman taught there were sixty-five pupils, none of whom could speak English, but within two years they could all speak English fairly well and that two of his old pupils were University graduates. As a result of having taught school, the honourable gentleman is going about describing that particular district in which he taught for fourteen months and taking unto himself the credit for the ability of the boys and girls in that part of the Province.

Now that district is only one of 4,822 in the Province which are doing the same type of work as that district is doing and with the same results, and school districts have been doing so ever since 1905 insofar as a school district can. The fact the honourable gentleman taught in that district for fourteen months has not been the sole reason for some boy making a success and going to the University. That is due to the inherent capabilities of the boy himself and a boy of any other nationality, similarly endowed and afforded opportunities of becoming a real citizen of Canada, would do as much. What does the honourable gentleman go on to say?—This was not in the Arm River by-election or during any election campaign, but back in 1924. This is what he says:

"But conditions in other parts are deplorable and it was up to the Conservatives to remedy them. Schools were being closed down for lack of funds and there must be something wrong when a Government allows that. In one particular locality of alien population there was a reign of terrorism going on, blackmailing and buildings being burnt down, the rural municipality's books were in the hand of the auditors and a solicitor had been threatened violence if he did not leave the town."

I could go on reading page after page * * *

Mr. Anderson: Not interested!

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: It will be more interesting to the honourable gentleman later on.

There are many other steps in the development of that feeling in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and, were it not for the fact that I do not wish to discuss activities which took place when Hon. Mr. Dunning was leader of the Government and before the honourable gentleman had the honour of being leader of the Opposition in this House, I might go into more intimate detail with regard to that. I will content myself with reading to you a statement which appeared in the editorial columns of a leading Conservative newspaper following the election in this Province in 1926 in the Federal Constituency of Prince Albert:

"The only candidate who could carry a typical Saskatchewan Liberal constituency against the Liberal candidate, Hon. W. L. M. King, or other anti-Conservative candidate, would be the Kaiser, the Crown Prince or Hindenburg. And not one of the three was nominated in Prince Albert."

Mr. Anderson: Who said that?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: The *Toronto Telegram*.

Mr. Anderson: You can't blame us for that.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: The honourable gentleman says "You can't blame him for that." I am trying to indicate to this House where this kind of thing had its origin, by quoting from papers belonging to the party he happens to lead in this Province, remarks made by members of that party in this Province and in other parts of Canada. I might read the comment of a very important weekly—*The Yorkton Enterprise*, of February 16, 1926. Here is what it says:

"The result (in Prince Albert) indicates that the electors of Prince Albert deeply resented the scurrilous personal attacks made on the Premier by some of his opponents during the campaign. These tin-horn politicians, who substitute personalities for political arguments, would be well-advised in future to confine their efforts to a section of the country where such tactics are understood. The West long ago discarded these degrading methods. Westerners prefer issues to personalities, reason to abuse."

Again, in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, which had for a number of years previous to that conducted a very strong campaign for the Progressive party in this western country, we read:

"It was a typical *Toronto Telegram* campaign, concerned more with the old animosities, prejudices and passions than with the political issues of the day. It smacked of the theory held in certain quarters in Toronto that if somebody doesn't agree with you he must be a traitor and deserves to be branded as such. It was the sort of campaign that has been a great success at times, in certain districts of Ontario where the mentality of the electors can be gauged by the fact that the *Toronto Telegram* is their favourite newspaper."

Well, we had all that introduced in Saskatchewan in 1926 and from that source. If my honourable friend is not satisfied his party is not connected closely enough with it, may I come a little closer home and deal with certain statements made by a gentleman who went on a speaking tour addressing meetings in the most outstanding cities of Western Canada. I speak of Dr. Edwards, Member of Parliament for Frontenac-Addington. Listen to this:

"Government policy has resulted in bringing to Canada large numbers from Continental Europe whose traditions and background make their assimilation difficult while the movement from the British Isles has been discouraged by vexatious and petty restrictions."

There has been carried on an investigation of these accusations and, according to the report of the Committee of the Dominion House, unanimously reached, these statements are not borne out by the facts. Then he goes on to say this:

"Roman Catholic organisations have been specially favoured while the activities of Protestant societies have been hampered by petty objections and unnecessary 'red tape.'"

"Having regard to back history and present-day events, the words of that great statesman, Sir A. T. Galt, expressed in 1877, were prophetic. He said:

"The conclusion is inevitable, from the nature of the means employed, that a deep-laid plan exists for the complete subjugation of Lower Canada to ecclesiastical rule with the view of extending the same baneful influence hereafter to the whole Dominion. In this view the importance of early and stern opposition to the scheme now being gradually disclosed becomes the duty of all good citizens, be they Catholic or Protestant."

That opinion, expressed in 1877, is quoted again by a prominent Conservative speaking in Western Canada, as justification for the statements he is making regarding both religion and immigration.

Now you ask me who has been responsible for the introduction of this discussion into the politics of Saskatchewan and why these ideas have been introduced into the discussion of public questions in Western Canada? I believe that with these statements before us, we in this House can come to the conclusion that these are the men, and these the periodicals in the different parts of Canada (such as, for example, the *Toronto Telegram*) that are responsible for the introduction of that discussion into Western Canada.

I am going to quote one more statement made, according to the *Toronto Mail and Empire*, by the leader of the Conservative party in this Province during the visit he made to Kingston, Toronto and Hamilton, a year ago. He is reported in the *Mail and Empire* of September 21st, 1927, as saying:

"If steps are not taken to bring out the British born, the aliens are going to win out, according to the viewpoint of Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, leader of the Conservative party in Saskatchewan. For he knew of one case when a civil servant, in the employ of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture went about the Polish sections of that Province and learned of openings for three or four hundred immigrants. Then he went overseas with his wife as guests of the C.P.R., and arranged for the Poles to come to Canada."

Anderson Lowers Standard of Debate

These are the statements, Mr. Speaker, which have introduced this discussion into the public affairs of the Province of Saskatchewan. Someone says: "Why have you got this discussion in the Province of Saskatchewan and not in other Provinces of Canada?" Well, I say the reply is this: That this thing was first introduced into the politics of the Province of Saskatchewan when the present leader of the Conservative Party became leader of that party, and emphasised later when he entered this House as the quotations I have read will make evident. Never before, in my whole experience in this House, stretching back over fourteen, almost fifteen years, has the question of education been discussed in this House on the level it has been brought down to during the last four years; that is, until the member for Saskatoon became leader of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. Anderson: You haven't had half enough yet.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Maybe not! But there's more coming. Coming back to the election which recently took place and to the assertion that there were no misstatements made, Mr. Speaker, that there were no misrepresentations, nor insinuations and no statements that could be called untruthful; I am going to read now from the *Regina Daily Star*. This was said at Imperial:

"Dr. Anderson broke new ground when he charged Premier Gardiner with being a party to forcing Protestant children being taught by garbed clericals in public schools of the Province with religious emblems on the walls, and that, when the Protestants were driven to erect a separate school, the Jews and Orthodox Greeks in the district were refused their plea to send their children to the Protestant separate school and were compelled instead to send them to the public school where they were taught by Catholic clerics."

That is a pretty clear statement of what the honourable gentleman intended to say. What about the truthfulness of that statement? What about the misrepresentations in it?

Well, to begin with, he was speaking of a school at Wakaw, and there never, at any time, has been a crucifix upon the walls of that school; never, at any time. It states here, "in the public schools of the Province with religious emblems on the walls"—and we generally take the religious emblems, in a discussion of that sort, to mean the crucifix as it is the one that has been discussed most. Then it says, "being taught by garbed clericals and that when the Protestants were driven to erect a separate school, the Jews and Orthodox Greeks were refused their plea to send their children to the Protestant separate school and were compelled instead to send them to the public school."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the conditions in connection with all our schools are so clearly laid down that even had I wished to do such a thing as is said in this statement, I could not have done it. What are the facts?

The children spoken of have not been in the public school at Wakaw. These children have been going to the Protestant separate school. The question that has arisen is as to whether or not the taxes of the people who are not of the Roman Catholic faith and who are not Protestants, should be paid to the Protestant separate school. The law says that the taxes must go to the public school. The Government cannot change it. The Department of Education cannot change it—and these children were never forced at any time, to be taught by clerics in religious garb. No misrepresentations? No statements of untruth? No insinuations? Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe they are all contained in that one article that I have read; that is, in the speech of the leader of the Opposition.

Anderson's Belated Denial

I could go on and read some more. I am not going to do so, but I will confine myself to the statement made to newspapers on the day of polling in that particular election and which appeared on the day after the election. This statement was made to different newspapers in this Province by the leader of the Opposition, in an interview:

"The voice of Arm River is the Voice of Saskatchewan," said Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, at Craik, last night. "Mr. Gardiner and his cabinet here, and a large number of the members of his party, addressing meetings in rural and urban centres, frantically endeavoured to ward off a large Conservative majority."

"It will not escape the attention of the public that a small poll at Lakeside, near Holdfast, that a majority of the electors are Roman Catholics and are working hand in glove with Premier Gardiner."

The vote at Lakeside was 114 for Dr. Waugh and 6 for Mr. Adrain. No contention that a "Vote for Waugh was a Vote for the Church of Rome!" Why then, is this remark in the statement of the leader of the Conservative Party? And he goes on:

"The Conservative party believes in a square deal for all, but they don't believe in getting down on their knees to solicit the support of any individual or organisation whose aims and objects do not emphasise the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian Citizenship."

That statement is another statement which indicates that the member for Arm River was perfectly within his rights, the other day, when he complained of the campaign that was carried on against him.

Mr. Anderson: Speaking on a matter of privilege; I am taking this opportunity to state that I did not say what has just been read.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: The honourable gentleman has been a long time in denying—

Mr. Anderson: When a member of this House makes an assertion, I think the rules of the House demand that he be not insulted by his word being doubted.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: As a matter of fact, I have not yet had an opportunity to insult the honourable gentleman, or otherwise. What I was going to state was this: That the honourable gentleman has been a long time denying a statement that has gone the length and breadth of Canada, and I will leave it at that.

In order to clarify the remarks I had to make in connection with this matter, I want to read one other comment—not from the honourable gentleman himself, but from another gentleman, in order to indicate that not only the leader of the Opposition was making speeches of this type but that others of his followers were doing likewise.

J. F. Bryant's Sectarian Appeals

I have here in my hand the statement of no less a person than the President of the Conservative Party in the City of Regina and Conservative candidate in Lumsden (*Mr. J. F. Bryant*) to the effect that *The Saskatchewan Act* was passed at the dictation of the Catholic hierarchy of Quebec as a means of assuring the dominance of the Church of Rome in Canada. Then he goes on to say, speaking on October 24, 1928, as reported in the *Regina Daily Star*:

"The issues in this campaign were not made by the Conservative Party. The issues in this campaign were not made by the Liberal Party. They were made by the Church of Rome, and I thank God tonight that He has given me clear vision to see the issues as they really are. I would be untrue to my forefathers and to the Empire in which I was born, if, seeing these issues clearly, I failed to place them before you through lack of personal courage or from fear of personal consequences."

"There has been no clearer issue on the page of history. The Liberal Party at Ottawa and the Gardiner Government in Saskatchewan have lined up with the forces of the Church of Rome in this struggle for supremacy."

That is a pretty clear charge, Mr. Speaker. Anyone can understand it—and yet my friend gets up and says that they did not introduce the discussion of that question into the Arm River by-election, and that they have not been responsible for placing before the people of this Province ideas that are contrary to what are known to be the real facts of the situation. Then he goes on to say that "bilingualism is fostered and encouraged" by the Government and that French priests have been appointed as inspectors of schools.

No untruths? No insinuations? There has not been a school inspector, at any time, appointed in this Province to inspect French schools separate from any other schools. Our school inspectors all are appointed for the purpose of inspecting all the schools of the district in which they are placed, whether occupied by French, Scandinavian, Russian, German, or people of any other nationality—or, I should say, by children born of parents who came from these countries but who, born in this country, are not of these countries but of the Dominion of Canada.

I do not think I need read anything more in this connection to leave the fact with you that this whole question was introduced by the speakers of the party to which I have been referring. Further, I would say this: That in the discussion of the future, I hope that we will be in a position to deal with public questions whether they relate to education or anything else, without bringing in matters of this brand.

You ask me why I have mentioned that! You can go back and read my speeches from the time I came into this Legislature in 1914, and you will not find a single word, publicly or otherwise condemning the religious faith of any people in this Province or elsewhere, or condemning the nationality or language of any people in this Province or elsewhere. I have attempted to keep discussion of this kind on a plane casting no reflections on the nationality or the ancestors of the people who are in the Dominion of Canada, but considering them, and dealing with them, as actually Canadians.

Saskatchewan's Population Analysed

On this point, I have taken considerable trouble to analyse the population and have come to certain conclusions as to what the future citizenship of this Province is likely to become. When analysing these figures, not only for Saskatchewan but for Eastern Canada as well, I have taken some trouble to enquire whether the great majority of the people in Saskatchewan have been born within the British Empire. And what was the reply when I said that 76 per cent. were born within the British Empire? Members opposite and their friends have said that I had stated that 76 per cent. were British born. I have never said that 76 per cent. were British born, but I repeat again, as I said before, that 76 per cent. of the people of this Province were born within the British Empire, which is a slightly different thing. But—you cannot make political capital out of that; so they had to make it "British born," and my honourable friends did not hesitate to say that 76 per cent. of the population of Saskatchewan, according to myself, were British born, and then they proceeded to disprove that statement.

What are the facts? We have 820,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan, and 624,000 of them were actually born within the British Empire; and of that 624,000, some 361,000 were actually born in the Province of Saskatchewan. Again, 161,000 of them were born in other Provinces of Canada, and no less a number than 100,000 were born at the very centre of the Empire, the British Isles. Of the balance of 196,000, there were 76,000 born in the United States, leaving only 120,000 in the whole of the Province of Saskatchewan born outside the British Empire and outside the United States. Now, where were these men and women born? The answer is: 33,500 were born in the three Germanic countries—Germany, Austria and Hungary; 20,000 were born in Scandinavian countries, and 27,000 were born in Russia and 10,600 are Ukrainians. The question I want to ask is this? Will any of these people become Germans because they live in Canada? Will any of them become Russians because they live in Canada? Not by any means! The children of these people born in other countries, have been brought to the Dominion of Canada at a very young age, and educated in our schools. We shall have a population in Canada known as Canadian citizens, which shall compare favourably with the citizenship of any country in the world.

Having dealt with that statement, Mr. Speaker, as to where these contentions came from and what the position of the Opposition and of ourselves has been upon the matter, I want to deal with just one other item from the *Regina Daily Star*, quoting the speech of the leader of the Conservative party in the House, the other day:

"I have no pleasure in dragging out the political skeletons from the dark closets of the Government, but when the Government candidate in Arm River, in my presence, tells the people that in 23 years his party has never had a scandal, is it not my duty to correct him and tell of the Bradshaw matter?"

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be present on the platform on the occasion of the first meeting held in the Arm River campaign and in his address the member for Arm River made a statement to this effect: He said we have had in this Province a Liberal Government for 23 years and never has any charge of scandal been proven in the entire 23 years. Why, anyone can "make" a charge of scandal. But it is an entirely different matter to "prove" a charge of scandal, and it is the absolute truth that there has never been, in the 23 years of this Province's existence, a single charge of scandal proven against the Government in these 23 years—and no one on the Opposition side of the House will get up and refute the statement I have now made.

The Happyland Election

Then he went on to refer to the Happyland election of 1925:

"I have my duty to perform as leader of the Opposition and it will be expected of me that I refer to a matter brought up in the Arm River campaign while defending the sacredness of the ballot and the need to protect those who are ignorant of our language and customs. I said that I had reason to believe irregularities had taken place in the 1925 election.

"I said I had been informed that at poll 28, in the Happyland constituency, held in the Westerham school, many who were reported as having voted had indicated that they did not vote. One man, a school teacher, who was shown as having voted was at that time confined in Weyburn Mental Hospital."

Well, that is rather a mild way of putting it. That he had been informed that at poll 28 held at Westerham school, many were reported as having voted who did not vote and one man, a school teacher, who was confined at that time in Weyburn Mental Hospital, was reported to have voted. I just want to read the report of what the honourable gentleman did say at that meeting, as it appeared in the *Regina Daily Star* of October 5, 1928, written and signed by the gentleman who was travelling with the opposition leader during the whole campaign:

"Dr. Anderson made specific charges that the Government in the last election had committed election frauds at Happyland and in other non-English constituencies * * *

"'I charge,' he said, 'that the Gardiner Government has wilfully violated the principles of British fair play and the sacredness of the ballot.'"

Is my honourable friend willing to repeat those charges? Is he likely to get up in this House and charge this Government with that sort of thing? Not at all. He goes to the town of Elbow and there he makes those statements or at least, is reported to have made them. He goes on:

"At Happyland and other places peopled by those not familiar with the English language, they took advantage of the ignorance of these people to break all laws of decency and the law of this Province in the last election.

"I have here in my hand a list of 30 names of foreign voters whose names were put on the poll books by the deputy returning officer and whose votes were polled without the knowledge of the voters.

"Unfortunately the poll books are destroyed so we cannot prosecute, but a man who knows the Gardiner machine, a former Liberal, tells me there were other cases too, including one at a schoolhouse where the vote was 98 to 2.

"We are not afraid to expose these things; we are not deceived by pious expressions of ministers who seek to pull the wool over your eyes."

Surely these charges are plain enough for every man on the street to know that the honourable gentleman charges this Government, up in Arm River, with being a party to these things! He charges this Government with stuffing the ballot boxes—charges this Government not only with knowledge of it but with actual committal! He goes on to make it more specific:

"They do not stop at heaping ridicule on those who are trying to improve public life in this Province. They do not stop at destroying characters. There are no depths they will not stoop to. When my party stoops to that sort of thing, I shall no longer be its leader."

To that I would say, he should have resigned about six weeks ago.

Mr. Hogan: He should never have been chosen.

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Perhaps you are right.

Mr. Anderson: Do you deny responsibility for any irregularities?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: Certainly. I don't admit there have been irregularities. I don't go around this Province charging men with things I cannot prove. What does my friend say in addition: "If I had had the information sooner, I would have presented it to the Legislature * * *" and Premier Gardiner was not sincere—that Premier Gardiner was afraid to bring it up in the House."

Now, my reason for referring to it here is this: When he did bring it up in the House, it was in the words I have quoted—the very indefinite words to which I have alluded. No charges here, with respect to any individuals! No charges here with regard to the Gardiner machine! No charges here with regard to the Dunning Government of 1925! No charges at all with regard to the member for Happyland! No charges with regard to the Deputy Returning Officer who was responsible, if anybody was responsible, for anything that he declares did take place in the conduct of that election!

After all, what is the charge? It is a charge of impersonation; that a certain person alleged to be mentally diseased was therefore unable to vote, that his name appeared upon the poll book and that someone voted for him. It is laid down in the Election Law of this Province as to what action can be taken in order to bring anyone to justice who either commits the act or permits the act to be committed as an official of the poll, knowing that the act was being committed. And within a month after the Writ was returned all the information that the Government or anyone else had in connection with this case was in the hands of the opposition, in the hands of Mr. Baldwin, the candidate who contested that constituency. He had six months in which to make his charges to the Courts and during all these months he laid no charges nor at any time until the Arm River by-election. And my honourable friend (*Mr. Anderson*) laid no charges until the Arm River by-election, until three years after the time limit had expired in which the matter could have been taken to the courts.

There are all kinds of precedents in cases of this kind. While here, last session, we heard of quite a number of things that we were going to hear something more of before the end of the Session. But we did not hear of them then. We heard of them out in the country.

Mr. Anderson: What were they?

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: You'll hear before the end of the Session, but, at the present time, I am making my own speech. As I said, we heard of matters last session that were going to be discussed later on in the Session; but we did not hear of them again during the Session. The same has been said this Session, but in case the matter might not be brought up later, I am going to state now: No member of the Government in 1925, to my knowledge and, I believe, to anybody else's knowledge—no member of the Government of the present day, had any knowledge of anything that took place in the constituency of Happyland of the nature suggested by my honourable friend. Further, with the information which was in possession of the opposition, they had the opportunity to lay an information before the courts as provided for in *The Election Act*, and, in inexpensive manner, to have it tried properly in the courts, and to have the guilty person, if convicted, punished for the offence.

As a matter of fact, the man who happened to be in charge of the particular poll mentioned (poll 28) is a gentleman who is not a supporter of the Liberal party. He is a man who has been a supporter of the Conservative party but supported the Liberal candidate in 1925 simply because there was a Progressive candidate running in that seat.

My honourable friend has never suggested that he was willing, then or now, to go to the extent of prosecuting in this case, but he is trying to infer that a charge should be laid against someone. He is simply trying to pin something to the Liberal party and members of the Government so that he can go out of the House and use it in future campaigns in the Province of Saskatchewan. I tell him, now, that we have nothing to hide and nothing to fear in connection with the Happyland election or in connection with any other election in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think, possibly, it might be well if I were to point out some of the actions that have been entered into in the past in similar matters and to show to the member for Saskatoon (*Mr. Anderson*) what has been done and what might be done in matters of this kind. First I will deal with *The Controverted Elections Act*: On the first page it is set out that at any time within one month, or thirty days, any defeated candidate or any duly qualified elector may petition against the undue return or undue election of any candidate. In this case, no such action was taken and may I repeat that all the information was in the hands of the Opposition within thirty days. Then again, there is provision made that where certain acts have been perpetrated by officials in connection with an election, an action can be taken within six months. It is provided that a charge can be laid before two J.P.'s in certain cases, or before a District Court Judge, and if the charge is proven, there is a penalty set for contravention of the Act. None of these actions have been taken, and if my honourable friend brings the matter up at a later date, he will find the Government prepared to deal with it in a manner that will meet with the approval of those who believe in maintaining the dignity of this House. (*Dr. Anderson did not bring the matter up again during the Session*).

That is all I wish to say in connection with these different charges. May I just, in conclusion, deal with some of the matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Royal Grain Inquiry Commission

We have referred to the appointment of a Commission to investigate the Grain Trade. That Commission was appointed after due consideration had been given to the many difficulties which our farmers have been reporting during the season immediately preceding the opening of this Session. Some people stated at the time, that the Commission would only go over the old ground covered by the Turgeon Commission in 1924, but it was contended by many others that the system of marketing wheat had so far changed because of the introduction of the Wheat Pool method that another investigation of the grain trade was due in Western Canada.

You ask me why the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan took action? One criticism made is that the Commission can only investigate practices of grading in this Province and cannot affect the inspections of the Department at Ottawa or the Wheat Pool. But, I say we have a duty to perform not only to those who are engaged in marketing but we have a much more important duty to perform towards the people who are producing grain in the Province of Saskatchewan. We are producing in this Province more than half the grain that enters into the export trade of the world so far as Canada is concerned, and we have a duty to protect the people producing that wheat to see to it that they receive every dollar coming to them for their efforts.

During last season, the crop was affected by wet weather. During this year, our wheat was affected by frost in the month of August, and we have had very little No. 1 and No. 2 wheat. If we had had No. 1 and No. 2 grades, there would have been no complaints from the farmers of Saskatchewan, in view of the enormous volume of the crop. But we have not had wheat of that quality in the Province this year, in any considerable amount, and it is with regard to the actions of those who were handling our grain in connection with grading that there has been a great deal of complaint about lower grades. In order to place before the farmers of the province and the grain trade as well the situation as it exists, we have appointed this Commission. I heard a newspaperman the other day say: "When I went down to Fort William, to the Head of the Lakes, with the Commission, I was under the impression that there was not very much for it to investigate, and, after I had been there I had intended to leave the Commission as soon as we got back to Saskatchewan. But, after we reached the first local point, I changed my mind. What did I find at that first point? There were 500 farmers there, many of whom had ridden all day the day before in order to be on hand to present their case," and, he said: "What I want to tell you is this: If you had not appointed this Commission, if you had not initiated this investigation," (and he put it almost in the words of one of the honourable members who has spoken in this debate) "the heather would have been on fire throughout the whole Province of Saskatchewan. In appointing this Commission you have provided a means whereby these men can come out before a regularly constituted Commission. They can state their ills and their remedies for the impediments to higher prices in connection with the marketing of the crop. They are assisted in the preparation of their cases." He said in addition that he had found because of the changes in the method of handling grain, there has been a change in the requirements of our farmers in connection with the different sections of *The Grain Act*. Because there has been a change, I believe that we will be in a position to go before the Federal Parliament at its next Session and make adequate representations based on actual facts and not based on conjectures gathered from all over the Province. These representations will be based on facts gathered

from the farmers, gathered from railwaymen, from grain dealers from Winnipeg and based upon information gathered at the Head of the Lakes. And when these representations are placed before the House at Ottawa, they will be given the consideration that representations of this kind deserve from the tribunal at Ottawa.

In asking the members to support the motion, may I say this: That we on this side of the House hope that all matters which come before the House having to do with the business of Government will be discussed from that business standpoint from which all matters of Government should be discussed. When we are discussing highways, let us not hear that cars are "throwing all the gravel into the farmers' fields." I heard of a conversation that took place, on the day of the opening. One gentleman said to the other: "This is going to be an interesting Session." And the other asked "Why?" "Oh, haven't you heard about all the charges?" And he said: "Why worry about that when the Government builds roads so good that cars travel so fast that they are throwing all the gravel into the farmers' fields."

There has been a complaint made that under our road policy, the Government left the graveling of the roads until the fall instead of starting in the spring, and my reply to that is, that it is in the fall we have the dry weather. For the benefit of those who have been making criticisms of that nature, I would point out if we had started this work in the spring of the year, the trucks used by the contractors for the hauling of gravel weighing, as they do, as much as six tons when loaded, would have cut the road bed to pieces. By leaving it until the proper time of the year we have been able to gravel almost four hundred miles of highway this year, bringing the total of gravelled highway in the Province now maintained by the Department of Highways well over four hundred miles.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say this: Let us during this Session and during the next election campaign (whenever that may be), grapple with the real problems that are confronting us as a Government and as a people; let us grapple with the real questions of finance and highways, so that the discussions will be of service, not only to the Government that some of us may form, not only to the people of Saskatchewan, but to the people of the whole Dominion of Canada.

HON. J. M. UHRICH

Minister of Public Health and of Public Works

Speech delivered in the Legislature on December 13, 1928,
on the Address.

The Honourable Mr. Uhrich, in speaking during the Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, said:

Mr. Speaker:—

First of all, Sir, I wish to join with the honourable members who have preceded me in this debate, in expressing my sympathy and concern regarding the grave illness from which His Majesty the King is suffering at the present time. I am sure the anxiety of all the people of the Province, of the Dominion and throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations was relieved this morning when they learned that His Majesty is rallying and I feel I am expressing the sentiment of all our people when I voice the hope that he will recover very soon and again be blessed with good health.

Now, it is to me, more than an ordinary pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to add my own to the congratulations which members of the House who have preceded me in this debate have bestowed so deservedly and generously upon my friends, the Member for Kinistino (*Mr. McIntosh*), and the Member for Arm River (*Mr. Waugh*), for the manner in which they moved and seconded this Address. I am sure that, as far as the Member for Kinistino is concerned, who has been here since 1925, we all admit that upon this occasion he has again shown us the grasp he has of public affairs and the facility he has of presenting them in a logical and efficient manner. Regarding my honourable friend from Arm River who is new to this House, let me say that all of us who had the privilege of following his remarks can testify to the fact that he has acquitted himself in a most creditable manner—creditable to himself and to the constituents he represents.

Let me add a few words of personal congratulation and appreciation. He and I, twenty years ago, met for the first time in Regina when we wrote our examination for admission to the medical profession in this Province. From that period until now, he has given his very best in dark weather and fair, in good years and in lean, and I know of no other man in the Province who enjoys a closer relationship or a greater friendship with his clientele and the other people in his district (and deservedly so), than my honourable friend from Arm River.

It was not my intention to speak had it not been for the remarks of the Leader of the Conservative Party (*Mr. Anderson*), when he spoke in this debate. Regarding the speech which he delivered and the remarks he made, the least I can say is that my honourable friend was not in a very happy frame of mind. There were several occasions on which it was apparent he had severely cudgelled his brain to find a line of attack upon the present administration. The method he followed was not altogether unique to the honourable gentleman nor to this occasion.

The Arm River by-election to which he referred has shown him to be the world's greatest heavy-weight self-jollier. His method of complaint at that time, which he reiterated, was his usual method. When arguments were lacking he substituted copious doses of vituperation which can best be described as "back-fence" gossip. If, during that campaign, he said everything that has been ascribed to him by my honourable friend's "independent" newspaper in the City of Regina, all I can say is that he is a very sick man indeed, and that his gangrene should be attended to.

The Arm River campaign, of course, was rather remarkable for the frenzy and hunger for office evidenced by the wild, reckless and almost irresponsible utterances of some of the opposition orators, their futile solutions for Saskatchewan problems, and the fervor with which the religious prejudice drum was thumped from one end of the riding to the other.

Right from the beginning, my honourable friend took a great deal of delight in predicting the defeat of the Government in that particular by-election. We find him even on the day of nomination of his candidate, as reported in his "independent" newspaper, making the statement that the Government was "facing defeat." On June 1st I find him "challenging the Liberals to hold an election."

Now, my honourable friend has always been a great little challenger. In 1925 he went up and down the whole Province of Saskatchewan challenging each and every member of the Cabinet and on one particular occasion challenging the whole Cabinet. We find him reported as follows, in the *Regina Leader* of June 1, 1928, with reference to the Arm River by-election:

"He joined in the challenge to the Liberal Government to go to the country at this time because of alleged discontent with the present administration. Dr. Anderson said they will try to keep you without representation at the Next Session of the House. They are afraid to run a by-election here because they will get beaten."

That was the great prophecy made. Well, I want to assure my honourable friend that we were not afraid, and that we did not intend to keep the constituency without representation, and the constituency has representation in this House during this Session.

Anderson's Campaign Fund Charges

We also find, Mr. Speaker, that in one of his meetings in that particular campaign he paid special attention to the Department of Public Works. I have in my hand a résumé of one of his meetings which was held in Elbow, where my honourable friend made use of the following words, according to the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* of October 5, 1928:

"There is no doubt at all that the contractors of our public buildings are asked to contribute to campaign funds. They will not deny it because it is true. I have a lot of information in connection with these contracts."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman has a lot of information in regard to contracts I think we are entitled to assume that he would have spoken of it in this debate—but, of course, as usual, we heard nothing about the information he has regarding the campaign funds from public buildings.

It is all very well when the honourable gentleman is out on the hustings for him to make use of this kind of argument. But when he comes into this House he coos like a turtle dove. We never hear of any of these things on the floor of the House; only when he is on the hustings.

To disabuse my honourable friend's mind of any suspicions, I shall read to him, Mr. Speaker, the various contracts that have been let since I have been Minister of Public Works and I charge my honourable friend to take down these figures and I shall then try to explain to him how impossible it is under the system that prevails at the present time to collect campaign funds on tenders submitted.

The tenders for construction of these buildings are advertised for weeks in advance in the newspapers. All these tenders are opened in public and usually all the contractors are present at the time. A minister is always present—if not the Minister of Public Works, then the Minister of some other Department.

We will take the tenders for Prince Albert Court House. Four tenders were received as follows:

	Floretyle solid	Floor slab concrete
Wilson & Wilson.....	\$140,800.00	\$140,500.00
A. W. Cassidy & Co.....	139,437.00	139,957.00
Poole Construction Co.....	144,800.00	
Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	137,970.00	137,150.00

The contract was awarded to Smith Bros. & Wilson at \$137,970.00—which was the lowest tender.

Now take the Weyburn Court House tenders. The following were received:

	Trus-con
P. W. Graham & Sons.....	\$81,963.00
Bird, Woodall & Simpson.....	84,450.00
Wilson & Wilson Ltd.....	83,135.00
E. C. W. Johnston.....	85,900.00
Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	83,770.00

Wilson & Wilson, submitting the lowest tender, received the contract for the Weyburn Court House.

Now take the Melfort Court House tenders:

	Trus-con	Massillon
Wilson & Wilson.....	\$60,724.00	\$60,674.00
A. W. Cassidy Co., Ltd.....	62,235.00	61,195.00
Bird, Woodall & Simpson.....	60,900.00	60,800.00
Poole Construction Co.....	61,987.00	61,987.00
C. M. Miners Construction Co.....	63,850.00	64,264.00

The lowest tender being from Wilson & Wilson, the contract was awarded to that firm.

Now take the Gravelbourg Court House tenders:

J. L. Guay.....	\$54,994.00
Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	44,700.00
Hamilton Construction Company Ltd.....	49,200.00
Poole Construction Co.....	52,783.00
A. W. Cassidy Co.....	46,748.00
Wilson & Wilson.....	45,325.00

Smith Bros & Wilson, having submitted the lowest tender, the contract was awarded to them.

Mr. Anderson: May I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Uhrich: No, you may not! I did not interrupt you while you were speaking. Sit down and take your medicine like a man!

Shaunavon Court House: These tenders were received.

Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	\$43,175.00
J. P. Moore.....	55,400.00
E. L. P. Strickland.....	58,200.00
Hamilton Construction Co.....	48,100.00
Poole Construction Co.....	51,983.00
A. W. Cassidy Co.....	46,148.00
Wilson & Wilson.....	44,125.00

The lowest tender was from Smith Bros. & Wilson and they were awarded the contract.

Wynyard Court House tenders were:

Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	\$42,870.00
Hamilton Construction Co.....	48,100.00
A. W. Cassidy Co.....	45,148.00
P. W. Graham.....	43,735.00
Wilson & Wilson.....	44,125.00
James Young.....	49,750.00

Again the lowest tender being from Smith Bros. & Wilson, they were given the contract.

We come to the tenders for Moose Jaw Normal School:

Alex. Ferguson Ltd.....	\$362,000.00
A. W. Cassidy Co.....	343,454.00
Smith Bros. & Wilson.....	357,700.00
Wilson & Wilson.....	346,495.00
Bird, Woodall & Simpson.....	352,000.00
Poole Construction Co.....	363,000.00

The lowest tender was submitted by A. W. Cassidy, and he is constructing the Moose Jaw Normal School.

Prince Albert Sanatorium tenders were:

Poole Construction Co.....	\$609,800.50	Trus-con
Wilson & Wilson Ltd.....	599,750.00	607,250.00
A. W. Cassidy Co.....	645,446.00	644,246.00

Again Wilson & Wilson submitting the lowest tender were awarded the contract.

This list shows conclusively to the House that every contract was awarded to the firm submitting the lowest tender. Every one of these tenders was opened in public and, consequently, it was absolutely impossible for any of the men to contribute anything to campaign funds.

No United States Coal Imported

At the meeting which was held in the City of Saskatoon at that great Conservative picnic on June 28th, I find my honourable friend, the junior member for Saskatoon (*Mr. McConnell*), made the following remarks. He said: "The coal here in Saskatchewan used in the Government buildings was imported from the United States." Well now . . .

Mr. McConnell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to say that I did not make that statement.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: My honourable friend says he is wrongly reported in the *Phænix* of Saskatoon. Our Tory friends, as a rule, claim to be incorrectly reported in practically all the newspapers of the Dominion of Canada. My friend says he did not make that particular statement. I must accept his denial.

Mr. McConnell: I said "brick" was imported.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I am talking about coal. If you refer to this newspaper you will find you are alleged to have said "coal."

Mr. McConnell: What is the date?

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: June 28, 1928, *Saskatoon Phænix*. My honourable friend says he did not make such a statement. Under the rules of the House I am forced to accept his denial, but, if there should be any suspicion in my honourable friend's mind, let me assure him, here and now, that not one single pound of United States coal has been imported since 1917 (the year of the coal famine), by the Government for use in our Government buildings. I also find my honourable

friend, the junior member from Saskatoon, on that particular occasion, made use of this statement, as reported in the same newspaper, June 28, 1928:

"He referred to the Government Telephone Office and stated imported bricks had been used instead of those produced in the Province."

Mr. McConnell: Correct!

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: Well now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend made use of that statement in the House, last Session, and when he exploded that bomb he had the galleries packed to see the downfall of this Government, but it took my honourable friend, the Minister of Telephones (*Hon. Mr. Patterson*) just two minutes to explain the whole thing. Every member of this House knows the answer which was given—that a few hundred bricks were imported from the United States to match certain face brick in the building which was being extended at the time—bricks which we had tried to buy in the Province of Saskatchewan and could not. We could not get any of our own companies to manufacture them, and we were compelled to import these from the United States to match. My honourable friend knows that, when the explanation was made it was accepted by him at that time. Yet, even after the Minister had made that statement on his honour, my honourable friend, at the first opportunity repeats his allegation that the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan is importing American bricks instead of using our own.

Mr. McConnell: I will leave it to the people of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I will leave it to the members of this House to say what is in that statement. Of course, my honourable friend from Saskatoon is rather an engaging old dear, amusingly critical. His stuff has all the potency and violent kick of a bottle of sarsaparilla. He accompanies the honourable, the leader of the Tory Party and he also speaks at his meetings. Good company!

Mr. Anderson: Hear, hear!

Anderson on the Hustings vs. Anderson in the Legislature

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I have a few more remarks made by the Tory leader at this meeting at Elbow. He is reported as follows in *The Star-Phoenix*, October 5, 1928:

"He declared that an attempt had been made at the opening of this campaign to deceive the people. That ridiculous rag, *The Regina Leader*, as the newspaper was described by the speaker, had, he said, printed statements supposed to have been made by the Premier at Imperial which the Premier had never uttered. He gave several instances to support his claim and said the Premier had feared to repeat statements given to the paper beforehand because the leader of the Opposition was present at the meeting."

My honourable friends know that the Premier is not wearing out any shoe leather running away from anybody, and no member on this side runs away from the Tory leader insofar as his utterances in this House are concerned. Here is another of his gems, reported in the same paper:

"Declaring that the Liberal organization had plenty of money with which to carry on the fight, Dr. Anderson suggested that such money was coming from the brewers selling beer to the Government, men selling 'boozie' to the liquor stores, road contractors who had been awarded contracts by the Government and contractors for public buildings. 'For that,' he said, 'we believe our public buildings are costing us more.'"

Well now, I do not think it is out of the way to assume that if the honourable gentleman had any such information he would have given it to us, when he was speaking to the Address. But, there was not one word! It is all very well to make insinuations and suppositions of that brand to mislead the people when he is away out in remote parts of the Province!

Another report of his statements reads thus:

"On the subject of education, he said that boys and girls were growing up under a handicap under the educational system of the Gardiner Government. He said children were growing up to manhood and womanhood without even rudimentary knowledge of the English language."

I should like my honourable friend to tell us where these people are growing up without any knowledge of the English language! I should like him to mention the names of some of these schools on the floor of the House! If any such condition exists, we should like to know it! But not one word!

Opposition Leader and Regina Jail

My honourable friend, the leader of the Tory Party, was very much interested in the Regina Jail. I understand that he made a visit to that institution, which, of course, surprised me considerably. Among other things, I find this quotation from my honourable friend's speech made in Regina, on November 22, and reported in his "independent" newspaper:

"I had always thought," he said, "that men who were sentenced to do hard labour on the stone pile did hard work with big hammers. The hammers they use at Regina Jail are about the size of an ordinary carpenter's hammer and the prisoner sits on one large stone

and taps away at a small piece of rock placed on another large stone. There were soft cushions lying around and I asked what they were for. I was told that the cushions were given to the prisoners to sit down on while they worked at the rock pile. I did not notice if they served them with hot water bottles."

I can assure my honourable friend if there had been any necessity, they would have been given hot water bottles, too. For the information of my honourable friends I may say that the visit of the honourable, the Tory leader, to the jail was made on November 23rd. It was cold at the time and these men who were engaged in breaking rocks were sitting on the stone on gunny sacks which they had stuffed with a little hay. If we did not supply the gunny sacks, half our infirmaries would be full. The only thing I can say is, I hope that, if my honourable friend ever gets into the custody of the Warden of the Regina Jail, the latter will be more considerate of him than my honourable friend would be of the prisoners. I find that on November 6th, a representative of his ally, the "*Regina Star*" made a visit to Regina Jail and certain statements appeared in the particular issue of that day. I find this:

"Regina Jail is Conducted Upon Efficient Lines."

And continuing, the writer describes things, describes the routine in the gaol and the hospital ward, as follows:

"Despite the fact that there is such a large number of inmates, it is a remarkable fact that the hospital ward is the only part of the jail which is unoccupied, a fact which speaks most highly for the efficiency of the authorities."

It seems to me strange, in view of the close connection between my honourable friend and the "*Regina Star*" that he and the "*Star*" representative should come away with diametrically opposite opinions regarding this matter. We find, furthermore, the same newspaper saying this:

"With the tour of the jail over, the party was then taken over the prison farm. This consists of a full section and the crops this year were very good. The stables are kept in excellent condition, while the horses and cattle give the appearance of having been splendidly cared for. The pigs make a fine exhibit, while the splendid flock of sheep appear to be of very high quality."

Well, this is the opinion of my friend's "independent" newspaper, so, if he should want any more information with regard to the Regina Jail, I would advise him to consult that newspaper.

Opposition Leader and Weyburn Mental Hospital

I have here another report of a meeting that was held in Arm River Constituency, this time at the town of Liberty, where, as reported by my friend's paper: "Anderson Hits Weyburn Mental Hospital;" "Buckle Calls for Beer Halls."

"At Weyburn, alleged Dr. Anderson, he found men walking around an enclosure for exercise, ankle deep in water. He found two children who were not mentally deficient there, he said, because he was informed they were the illegitimate offspring of mothers who were in the institution. Dr. Anderson charged that the Superintendent was incompetent and appointed because he was a Liberal."

Now, I should like to ask: Was my honourable friend appointed to the Civil Service ten or eleven years ago because he was a Liberal? At least we know he quit the Tory Party cold in the middle of the 1911 campaign to take a school inspectorship!

Let us answer the last statement first. How does he know that these children were not mentally deficient? I know my honourable friend is not suffering from an insufficient appreciation of his own intellectual attainments, but I certainly never heard, and I did not know, that he claimed to be an expert psychiatrist. Let me tell him that it takes a sound medical training, and long practical and special experience, to judge whether or not these cases are mentally deficient. I know members of my profession in this House will bear me out in this. But my honourable friend puts himself up as a great diagnostician!

I have here a letter from the physician in charge of the particular case referred to which I shall read it:

"I notice that Dr. Anderson is paying some attention to our institution. His remarks are so far from the truth that I feel that I must refute the same. First, (I shall not mention the names of the persons) Jessie_____and Betty_____. These are two small girls that I showed Dr. Anderson while here and drew his attention to the fact that we were yet uncertain as to the amount of insanity or feeble-mindedness there might be. However, I drew his attention to the fact that Jessie's grandmother died in an institution and that her mother was an inmate here and it was probable that the child would also develop trouble; that as soon as we were satisfied as to their mental status, steps would be taken to place them under Reynolds' care or some other institutional care where they could be adopted. Since that time Jessie has had a real disturbance, was depressed, lost weight, and can now be classified. She is in her proper place notwithstanding an expert of Dr. Anderson's standing. We rely on our own staff and up to the present our courts have readily accepted the conclusion of our experts."

"Betty was about two years old when sent here, weighed 23 pounds and could not stand, very emaciated. We gave her electrical treatment and massage and she is walking around

now and fairly smart. However, she is a defective and will always need supervision. I am attaching Dr. Campbell's report on these two cases and also on Madeleine——— who was the child he mentioned with a hereditary disease. As to our wards and the general condition of our Hospital we are always complimented on their clean and sanitary condition and always open for inspection."

Now, I have here the report of Dr. Campbell. I wonder if my honourable friend will say his report is false. I wonder if he will question the judgment of a psychiatrist of Dr. Campbell's calibre. This is his report:

"It appears there are three children in this institution about whom the question has been raised as to their fitness to be here. The oldest is Madeleine———, a little girl who was six years old in May of 1928 and it appears the point raised in her case is that in as much as she is a case of congenital syphilis and her mental defect is due to this condition that she should not be among other children. If this little girl should grow to adult years and have children of her own possibly she could transmit this strain to her own offspring. In so far as communicating it to other children or to adults either for that matter there is just as much likelihood of her communicating appendicitis or housemaid's knee and the other children are in no danger whatever of contracting syphilis from this case. Her mother has not at any time been an inmate of this hospital.

"The other two children are younger. Betty——— and Jessie———. Betty was sent to this institution from the Salvation Army Shelter and the medical certificate in her case before coming here indicates mental defects present. She was two years of age at the time of admission here and has been here a little over a year. At the time of admission she weighed 23½ pounds, did not walk or talk, and while with massage and general treatment we have been able to advance her to the point she walks she does not talk very much even yet. The child is unquestionably definitely retarded for her age and it will be some little time yet before we will know for certain whether or not she is going to advance sufficiently to be graded outside of the defective class. This I doubt very much at the present time. Her mother has not been an inmate of this institution. The history we have here is that the mother deserted the child soon after it was born and the father of the child is not known.

"Jessie——— was brought to this institution with her mother as apparently it was felt that the child had little chance of being normal in view of the mother's mental condition all through her pregnancy. The history we have is to the effect that the child's grandmother was also insane. For a time this child promised to do fairly well though she was definitely retarded in comparison with a normal child but during the past summer her condition would indicate that it is most improbable that she will develop into a normal child.

"On different occasions we have had children under observation here who were borderline cases and as soon as it was felt that a certificate could be given to the Bureau of Child Protection that the mental condition of these children would allow them to get along reasonably well outside of the institution they have been removed and placed in foster homes. In two or three instances as these children became older arrest of development took place and they had to be returned here. I am quite sure that the Bureau of Child Protection are willing to do the same in the case of these two children if I would furnish them with a similar certificate.

"While to the casual observer these children may appear normal, with their family history in mind, the development they have shown since coming here and my knowledge of mental defect I am certainly not prepared at the present time to give any such certificate in the case of either of them without further observation and I would certainly advise any friend of mine against adopting either of them.

"In the meantime it should be pointed out that instead of suffering any ill effects from their stay in this institution they have both derived a good deal of benefit."

Now, my honourable friend made a remark concerning what we call the 'airing court' at the Mental Hospital at Weyburn. He said he found men walking around in a muddy and damp yard enclosed by 15-feet board fences and brick walls. Without going any further, I will leave this matter to the intelligence of the people of this Province. Thousands of people from all over Saskatchewan, from other Provinces and from the United States, visit our institutions every year—thousands and thousands of them—and in not one instance has there ever been any complaint or criticism regarding our institutions. Yet my honourable friend says he found these men walking around, taking exercise, ankle deep in water! I shall read an explanation of this as given by the Superintendent of the Weyburn Mental Hospital:

"We have a very clean dry Court and even after a heavy rain, it is always dry. We have nearly a foot of sand over the whole area and this readily absorbs any rain. Mr. Anderson visited us on April 16th, and we had a very heavy rain the night before. Between the hospital door and the Airing Court some water does lie after a heavy storm but we always have planks for the patients to cross over. The day of Dr. Anderson's visit there was some water here but the planks were in place and no patient had wet feet. The Airing Court where the patients were taking exercise was free of water. Any water was outside of the Court and in paths leading to it. I am attaching a report on this signed by the Chief Attendant and Assistant Chief. I feel very strongly on this matter and resent such uncalled for remarks."

My honourable friend also made reference to the fact that the Superintendent was appointed because he was a Liberal. To this the Superintendent replies:

"So far as being a Liberal and a supporter of the Liberal party, I have always been such and was endorsed in my action by the electors of Weyburn at three elections, my majority increasing at each election from 28 to 807. In the Legislature I always had the confidence of all parties both as Chairman of Legislative Committees and as Speaker, being complimented by Mr. MacLean, the Leader of the Opposition, on my fairness, in fact Mr. MacLean spoke to the Premier, Mr. Martin, about the advisability of having me permanent Speaker as in England."

Well now, that is the explanation of the 'Airing Court'; and I have also a statement made by the Chief Attendant and the Assistant Chief Attendant to the effect no patients are taken out for exercise when it is raining, but, should it clear up after a rain and the 'Airing Courts' are in fit condition, the patients are taken out:

"We have eight or ten inches of sand over the Airing Court. In some places for instance where there is considerable traffic by the patients returning to and coming from the Airing Court or where some of the patients have been playing in the sand or scuffing it out with their hands and feet which they do and where a few patients continually parade up and down in one particular place, there is a decline and when it rains it makes a puddle. It is only after heavy rains that the water stands above the ground because the sand absorbs considerable moisture. When the water does stand on the ground we dig ditches through the Airing Courts to take the water away. At no time have we seen patients walking through water ankle deep or through water of any kind, as we do not permit the patients out while there is water on the ground."

Well, so far as disabusing my honourable friend's mind regarding the Weyburn Mental Hospital is concerned, I shall have something to say later on.

"Whispering Campaign" in Arm River

My honourable friend, in speaking the other day, made reference to a certain "whispering campaign" that was alleged to be going on during the Arm River by-election. In this contention, of course, he was not alone. Reading over the newspapers I find there was quite a number of the members of the Tory party who made reference to this "whispering campaign" that was said to be going on there. There was, for example, the allegation of the candidate for the Tory party, Mr. Adrain and I find this in the columns of my friend's paper, the *Regina Daily Star*:

"Mr. Adrain was in fighting trim and said a whispering campaign was being carried on against him."

And further on mention again was made of this "whispering campaign". The paper says:

"He again referred to statements alleged to have been made concerning his speech at the Orange celebration in Watrous. It had been an attempt to show he was not a friend of Roman Catholics."

Now, being curious as to what this "whispering campaign" meant, I took the trouble to look up this Watrous speech which was made by my honourable friend's candidate, Mr. Adrain. I was anxious to find out about this thing. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the July 14th issue of the *Saskatoon Daily Star* in which the following report of Mr. Adrain's remarks appear:

"Did the Orange Order in the Great War contribute her share to procure for the world these great principles, liberty and justice upon which the Order is founded," he asked. "They gave their lives that Canada might be free. Behind them on many fields of battle were the ideals of liberty, justice and equal rights to all people."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say "hear, hear" to that—but the report continues:

"Where were our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen? Putting every obstacle in the way of the Government of the country to the successful carrying on of the war" he declared. "The only Province that refused to do its duty was the one where Romanism is dominant and where the priests rule."

Well now, Mr. Speaker and honourable members of the Legislature, we know where this "whispering campaign" started. It was not very much of a "whispering campaign." I think what I have quoted ought to be sufficient if the Tory leader wants to know or to find out where it started. It speaks for itself, and I shall not take the time of the House to enlarge upon it.

Anderson Balked at Investigation

My honourable friend, during the last Session, was rather perturbed about our public institutions; in fact, so much so that he arose in his seat in the House and moved a resolution to have this Legislature nominate a Committee to investigate the public institutions of the Province. Every member of the House, of course, will remember the incident. We on this side did not object. We said them as we say now that our public institutions are always open to any one who wants to go through them. We, therefore, acquiesced to his request and agreed that a committee be appointed to investigate the public institutions of our Province. But listen,

in connection with the campaign at Arm River, I find that the honourable member for Tisdale, (*Mr. Buckle*), speaking at Holdfast is reported thus:

"In conclusion, he dealt with the Department of Public Works and said a great saving could be effected in this connection. He alleged great sums of money were spent with the only object in view, of holding the local vote and with no real necessity for the expenditure. Conservatives at the last Session had forced the Government to appoint a committee to investigate conditions in the various Government institutions."

Not much forcing to it, Mr. Speaker!

For the benefit of the House, I will read my files on this matter. I concurred in the suggestion that such a committee should visit these various institutions but concluded that it was advisable to wait until the roads were dry so that we would be able, without difficulty, to reach the institutions by car. On May 5, last, therefore, I addressed a letter to my honourable friend, the leader of the Tory party reading as follows:

"You will remember that during the last Session of the Legislature, provision was made for the appointment of a representative committee consisting of members of the Legislature, for the purpose of visiting the public institutions in the Province.

"You have been appointed as a member of this committee and this letter to you is for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not you will act in this capacity."

Subsequently, I received my honourable friend's answer dated May 7, last, which reads as follows:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 5th and to state in reply that I shall be pleased to act as a member of the committee that will visit the public institutions of this Province.

"I should like very much to have some advance notice as to when this committee will start to function and I shall not make any engagements from June 1st on until I hear from you."

In the meantime, I had written the same letter to the other members of the committee that had been appointed—my honourable friend from Pelly, (*Mr. Tran*), my honourable friend from Lloydminster, (*Mr. Gordon*), my honourable friend from the City of Regina, (*Mr. McNiven*). These, with myself, constituted the committee. Subsequently, the honourable member for Lloydminster (I have his letter here on this file) informed me that he was unable to act and I had to appoint as a substitute the honourable member for Kinistino, (*Mr. McIntosh*). Now this letter of my honourable friend (*Mr. Anderson*) was dated May 7th, and, as I said, similar letters had been forwarded to other members of the committee. The honourable member for Lloydminster informed me on May 17th, that, owing to business reasons, he had to go East and so would be unable to act. He says: "I must thank you very kindly for considering me." Then I wrote a similar letter to the honourable member for Kinistino, and in due course I received a reply from him saying he would be pleased to act on the committee. I then wrote again to my honourable friends who had complied with my wishes to act, and to the Leader of the Conservative party, as follows:

"The members appointed for the purpose of investigating public institutions in the Province have now announced their willingness to act in that capacity.

"The personnel of the committee is as follows: Dr. C. E. Tran, M.L.A., Kamsack; Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, M.L.A., Saskatoon; Mr. D. A. McNiven, M.L.A., Regina; Mr. Chas. McIntosh, M.L.A., Kinistino, and myself.

"I am writing to all members of the committee today, asking them to inform me immediately as to the time when it would be convenient for them to act. The institutions to be visited are: Battleford Mental Hospital; Weyburn Mental Hospital; Prince Albert Jail; Regina Jail; Moosomin Jail; The Sanatorium, Saskatoon; The Home for the Infirm, Wolseley; The Industrial School for Boys, Regina.

"I shall be glad to hear from you regarding this matter as soon as possible."

This letter was written on June 6, after I had a substitute for my honourable friend from Lloydminster, and it was sent to all members of the committee. In due course, I received answers from my honourable friends representing Kinistino, Regina City and Pelly, and the following from the leader of the Conservative Party:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 6th and in reply may say that I shall be free to visit the public institutions referred to any time after July 1st. If, however, the other members of the committee prefer to act before this, I shall be pleased to make my plans accordingly."

You will note that he says "any time after July 1st." I also received a letter from the honourable member for Pelly, saying that he would act on the Committee. I ask you to note that the date mentioned in the letter from the Tory leader was "any time after July 1st." But, lo and behold! on July 3rd, there was a certain Tory Convention, at Regina, when they met to choose a candidate for the Constituency of Lumsden, and I find my friend, the leader of the Tory Party, making use of this expression when speaking about the Mental Hospital at Weyburn: "They (the Government), did agree to our suggestion to appoint a committee but it has not met yet." That was two days after July 1st, the date he had mentioned in his letter as the one following which he

would be prepared to act—"any time after July 1st" were his own words. Two days later, he mentions the matter at a Tory convention and makes the insinuation his remarks imply. My honourable friend knew better. It was done for a purpose. Again I wrote—this time on July 6th:

"I would suggest that the committee appointed for the purpose of inspecting public institutions in the Province, the personnel of which was given to you some time ago, be in Prince Albert on Thursday morning next, July 12th. The Jail and Jail Farm could be inspected on Thursday. Friday, July 13th, would be used in travelling from Prince Albert to North Battleford. The Mental Hospital at Battleford and the Institutional Farm could be inspected on Saturday, July 14th, and the members of the committee returning south could return on the Sunday morning train.

"I would suggest that the southern institutions which include the Regina Jail, the Industrial School for Boys, the Home for the Infirm at Wolseley, and the Weyburn Mental Hospital, be inspected on Thursday, Friday and Saturday of the following week—the 19th, 20th and 21st instant.

"Will you kindly inform me whether or not you will be present."

Somebody had to take the initiative, somebody had to take the lead in this and get four men together from the different parts of the Province in which they live. I tried to do the best I could under difficult circumstances.

Now, that letter was sent to each member of the committee. I received a wire from my honourable friend from Pelly that he could not find it possible to accompany us. Because of his extensive medical practice, I can quite understand that. I heard from the others, from Kinistino and from Regina, but there was no reply to that letter from the leader of the Tory Party. After we had inspected the Prince Albert Jail, however, I received this wire from my honourable friend. It says:

"Dr. Uhrich, care Dr. MacNeill, North Battleford, Saskatchewan. Will join committee North Battleford tomorrow morning."

In due time we reached North Battleford. My honourable friend was there, and the Battleford Mental Hospital was the only institution that the leader of the Tory party visited as a member of this committee which he was so desirous of having appointed. At no other time did he accompany the committee to investigate anything. Now I claim that shows how sincere is the interest that my honourable friend, the Tory leader, takes when it comes to investigating public institutions and forming an idea of how they are maintained, and the efficiency with which they are operated. But when it serves his purpose to go into the highways and byways of the Province and speak in a disparaging manner, he does not hesitate. He goes to the Weyburn Mental Hospital and afterwards makes those accusations and misstatements of fact. I have proved them misstatements of fact, particularly with reference to that remark made by the member for Tisdale that this committee was held up by me in the performance of its duty.

Tory Leader's Demand for Sworn Statements

Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, the leader of the Tory party, had more accusations to make in the campaign in Arm River. For instance, I find that, after speaking at Craik, October 9th, he was reported as follows in the *Manitoba Free Press*:

"With reference to the question of contracts and campaign funds' Dr. Anderson declared, 'let Mr. Gardiner produce sworn statements from every contractor who has had Government work during the past four years, sworn statements to the effect that they have not been approached with a request for campaign funds by any person on any occasion.'

"Let Mr. Gardiner also produce sworn statements that no hotelkeeper in this Province during the time he has been in public life has been approached and asked to give a sum to campaign funds; let Mr. Gardiner produce sworn statements from the brewers who supply beer to the "Gardiner Beer Stores" to the effect that they have not been approached and that no director has been approached for campaign contributions to the Liberal party; let Mr. Gardiner produce sworn statements from the chief bootleggers who operated in this Province during the days of prohibition, to the effect that they did not contribute to the Liberal Campaign Funds.'

Here is a man who is keen on sworn statements! He asks for them three, four or five times. But, Sir, that request ill becomes a man who does not believe in sworn statements. Furthermore, his system of logic appears to be somewhat like this: "You say you are not a thief, well then produce a sworn statement that you are not a thief." And let me repeat again, this is from a man who does not believe in sworn statements. He does not come out boldly and accuse the Premier of receiving campaign funds from the sources he mentions. He says: "Let the Premier produce sworn statements that he has not received them." That is his way of reasoning. It reminds me of a singed domestic cat hissing at a Royal Bengal tiger!

Beating the Racial Prejudice Drum

I have, in my hand, another statement of my honourable friend's, as reported in the *Regina Star* of October 15. Here is the heading: "With Tongue and Pen, With Song and Cartoon, Arm River Fight is Waged." The Tory leader in this House made the statement that at no time

was there any misstatement of fact, any appeal to racial prejudice. He absolutely denied all this when the seconder of the Address made mention of it. Here, in my friend's newspaper on October 15th, I find this paragraph:

"Some of the Germans it is said are passing around the assurance attributed to Honourable Dr. Uhrich in a speech in German at Holdfast, two or three years ago, that 'if the Germans will stand together we can control this Province'—whatever that may mean."

Oh, no! This independent newspaper of my honourable friend did not pound the racial prejudice drum in the Arm River by-election!

Furthermore, we find that on the day following the election, that is on October 30th, according to a report in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, the leader of the Tory party had an interesting meeting in the City of North Battleford, and he had as cohorts sitting with him on the platform, the honourable, the Junior Member for Regina—

Mr. MacPherson: I was not up there.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I beg pardon. I meant the Junior Member for the City of Saskatoon (*Mr. McConnell*). And he had another Tory with him, a representative from *The Regina Daily Star*, who, speaking on the school question was reported thus:

"Touching on the school question, it was his belief that in certain settlements, French was displacing the language of our mother tongue and religious beliefs were being taught in certain schools which were inimical in the highest degree to the public welfare of this Province."

He did not tell us what these religious beliefs were that were inimical in the highest degree to the public welfare of the Province. Nor did he tell us, at the time, where the settlements are in which French is displacing English as the language of instruction. Furthermore, this gentleman talks of his British Columbia experience, and I shall refer to him as "The Gentleman with the British Columbia experience," whatever that may be! He says: "There is in Saskatchewan, a deliberate attempt to overcome the British preponderance."

Oh, no! This gentleman did not beat the racial prejudice drum! And once more, in the *Regina Daily Star*, on October 27th, I find the following editorial under the heading "A Narrow Squeak.":

"The Premier had the support of a large foreign vote, as usual, but even in this the Opposition manifested an increasing strength. None the less it was a foreign vote that elected Dr. Waugh. . . .

"Dr. Waugh, if and when he takes his seat in the Legislature, will not represent the public opinion of Arm River, but of one section—of Lakeside. He will thus be able to sign himself 'Member for Lakeside.' "

And when I turn to the result of the election and look at the Lakeside poll I find 114 votes for Dr. Waugh and 6 for Mr. Adrain. Consequently, my honourable friend's "independent" newspaper claims that he has no right to consider himself the representative of Arm River constituency, but should regard himself as the "Member for Lakeside." No! the gentleman did not beat the racial prejudice drum in that by-election. It was not done in the Arm River campaign!

Now, my honourable friend had a good deal to say about myself in that campaign and even before it commenced. For instance, I have here in my hand a copy of the *Western Producer*—and this is not the report of a meeting. It is a statement by Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, dated June 14th, 1928:

"I have sat in the Legislature and had the finger of scorn tauntingly pointed at me by Dr. Uhrich and others because I belong to a certain fraternal organisation, but I have remained absolutely silent, as I steadfastly refused to be guilty of introducing religion into our Legislative Chamber. But not so Dr. Uhrich and Premier Gardiner. Both of these men are guilty and now that they have been discovered" . . .
(discovered, if you please!)

"they, in hypocritical fashion, try to lay the blame on me and my party."

That was on June 14th, in a signed statement to the *Western Producer*. I furthermore, find in the *Moose Jaw Times* that at a meeting held at Elbow on October 5th, a statement was made by the honourable gentleman which was reported as follows:

"Hon. Dr. Uhrich had ridiculed the *Orange Sentinel* in the House as had Hon. W. J. Patterson. It was not the place of anyone to hold up to ridicule the paper which represented the religious views of any body."

Furthermore, he peddles the same thing at Dinsmore on November 15th. He told the meeting that the Honourable J. M. Uhrich, Minister of Public Health, had in the House pointed "the finger of scorn" (again the finger of scorn) at him because he was a member of the Orange Lodge. But I shall not read any more on this point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every member of this House knows, and knows exactly, the statement and the occasion to which the honourable gentleman referred. At no time have I pointed the finger of scorn at him because he is an Orangeman, and at no time have I held up the *Orange Sentinel* to derision on the floor of this House. If you refer to the 1925 Sessional Papers (and most of the members here were present at the time), you will read exactly what was said on the occasion. I shall take the liberty of reading the account appearing on Page 92 of the 1925-26 Sessional Papers. Speaking at the time on the Address, I said as follows:

"The honourable, the Conservative Organiser, also made a speech in Prince Albert. He is reported in the *Prince Albert Herald* of May 23, 1924, as saying: "I want to make it clear. I have no intention of interfering with the freedom of the new Canadian to speak his own language or any others he desires to use. I wish I knew a few of their languages myself. I am firmly of the opinion, however, that the primary language, the common language of the province, should be English and I maintain with all the strength at my command that this language should be taught in the public schools and only this language."

Now I unquote:

A few days afterwards, in the *Prince Albert Herald*, there was a letter from the honourable, the Conservative Organiser, denying having made the statement attributed to him. His letter to the editor reads as follows: "In your report of my address at the Liberal-Conservative banquet held in your city on May 22 you feature the following statement which I positively did not make use of. You state that I said 'this language should be taught in the public schools and only this language.' I do not wish to raise any language question in the forthcoming provincial campaign, and see no need for doing so. I have been exceedingly careful to avoid anything like this and I cannot understand why your reporter should have so misinterpreted what I said. I am quite sure that those present did not so understand me."

Then I say further:

This letter was sent to the editor of the *Prince Albert Herald* and published a week after the meeting referred to. But I find at the end of the letter a note from the editor, reading as follows: "The reporter's copy of the above speech shows that whatever Dr. Anderson intended to say, he used the words he quotes in this letter. Further, in order to ensure the accuracy of the report of this speech, it was read to the Secretary of the Conservative Association before it was published and pronounced by him to be correct."

At this point my honourable friend interjected:

"I absolutely deny the truth of the impression created by the speaker."

Then I go on to say:

"I have here another report of his speech as reported in *Le Patriote* of Prince Albert on May 21, 1925. It is a translation from the French: 'I want to make it well understood that I have no intention of opposing the liberty of the new Canadian to speak his language or any other languages that he would like to use. I myself would like to be able to speak some of these languages. I am, however, of the strong opinion, that the primary language should be the English language and I maintain it with all the power available that this language must be taught in all schools and this language only.'

And then I ask him:

"Does the honourable, the Conservative Organiser say he has been wrongly reported in this paper?"

And he answers:

"Absolutely wrong."

Then I say:

"I have another quotation, Mr. Speaker."

And he interjects:

"All Liberal papers."

And then I say:

"This report is from the *Orange Sentinel* of June 9, 1925: 'Brother Anderson and Mr. G. A. Cruise have announced themselves definitely for one school and one language.'"

And I ask him:

"Is the honourable, the Conservative Organiser, wrongly reported in this paper?"

To which there is no reply.

Now that is all that was said on the floor of this House and every member who was in this Chamber at that time knows that what I'm saying is true. Surely, I submit, it is not wrong for me to quote from the *Orange Sentinel*. Surely it is not wrong when I use this paper as I can use any other paper, in this House, to clinch a fact! And yet my honourable friend goes through Arm River constituency saying that I pointed the finger of scorn at him because he is an Orangeman. And there is only one more incident which occurred when I was speaking on the Budget in 1925, where I made use of this statement:

"I find in this paper" (and I have here the same paper I used in 1925):

"The following questionnaire was submitted to each and all of the five candidates seeking the support of the electorate in Saskatoon at the provincial elections of June 2: (1) Do you believe in a non-sectarian public school system in Saskatchewan which shall be the only school system to receive aid from the public treasury?"

As quoted in this paper "Brother Dr. Anderson and Mr. G. A. Cruise were the only two candidates out of the five nominees who answered the above question satisfactorily. Both Brother Anderson and Mr. Cruise answered all the questions 'Yes.' They were the only candidates to do so."

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the light of what I have just read the statement that I pointed the 'finger of scorn' at him because he was an Orangeman, is an absolute falsehood. My honourable friend knew it when he made the statement. Still he goes on peddling this from place to place. Why does he do it? Yet he says he was not beating the religious prejudice drum! Oh no! Not at all.

More Misrepresentation

We have also another instance. My honourable friend made a number of statements regarding some of our Civil Servants, and about one in particular, Mr. J. J. Stevenson. And in this connection I find him saying in Dinsmore, on November 15th, that during the election campaign of 1925 J. J. Stevenson had written articles which had virtually said that the German Catholics should not vote for him (*Dr. Anderson*) because he was an Orangeman. Let us go through the files. We find that on October 9th, at Craik, he makes this statement:

"One, J. J. Stevenson, who in 1925 ran all over this province, leaving a slimy trail of accusations against me and my party, has recently felt the sting of just criticism and is now crying for mercy through the biased columns of the Government's mouth organ, *The Regina Leader*.

"Let me remind Stevenson that he resorted in 1925, with the knowledge and sanction of the Gardiner Government, to most contemptible political practices; let me remind him that there appeared in the German paper, *The Courier*, an article under his name, in which he appealed to a racial and religious prejudice. In this article he referred in contemptible terms to me as a member of two great Protestant fraternal organizations, and cunningly suggested that the Roman Catholic readers of this paper should not support my party, the inference being because I was a member of these societies."

I have here the original article to which my honourable friend refers—this 'terrible' article said to have been written by Mr. Stevenson in the German language in *The Courier*, a newspaper published in the City of Regina. I have here a translation of the article in question made by myself and I shall send the honourable gentleman the original copy so that he can correct me if my translation contains any errors. Here is this terrible article which my honourable friend says slandered him, because he is an Orangeman: The heading is (—) "Dr. Anderson and the New Canadians."

"The Opposition policy, opposed to the Dunning Government of Saskatchewan is gradually taking shape and form. In this connection the Conservative Organiser of the Province undertakes an unfortunate experiment: He makes the foreign born citizens of Saskatchewan, whom he styles by his own pet-name, "New Canadians," the main object of his campaign.

"Dr. J. T. M. Anderson is a prominent Free Mason and Orangeman. In this capacity he appeared as chief speaker at the annual Orange banquet held in Rouleau last week and was strongly supported by Mr. D. A. Kingsbury, the Grand Master of the A.F. and A.M. As Dr. Anderson does in all his speeches, he boasted here of his efforts as teacher among the New Canadians and thus created the impression that only those New Canadians who had been taught by him or whose education he had supervised made progress. That the Government came to the conclusion there was no necessity for a continuation of his efforts is, in his judgment, a terribly bad thing. According to this account, the pupils in some districts were taught to ignore the Sovereign and to refuse to sing the National Anthem. Such evil conditions, he believed, should receive consideration and this was possibly only through co-operation of organizations.

"In another meeting Dr. Anderson went still further and declared that in a certain place composed of foreign born population a system of terror, of extortion and incendiarism existed. The books of the rural municipality were in the hands of the auditors and a solicitor had been threatened with violence if he did not abandon the place. Premier Dunning and other members of the Government have repeatedly declared that these slanderous statements which concern almost half our population are wicked and dangerous.

"Dr. Anderson at these meetings of Orangemen and Conservatives urged a speeding up of British immigration and at the same time urged that the immigration from other countries should cease. On the contrary, Premier Dunning in his public speeches in England during the past summer explained to his fellow-countrymen that he was opposed to closing the doors to those who were not "of our blood". He has always held the view that the

future citizenship of Canada would be richer in tradition and diversity of ability and service if the various races, each having something valuable to contribute, worked together in harmony for the development of the province.

"Dr. Anderson tries to seek the favour of the Provincial Progressive Party, which, however, as an organisation exists to a large extent only on paper, and wants to bring about an election in which the three parties will participate. In this way Dr. Anderson hopes to make the Conservatives the largest group at the next provincial election. This, however, can scarcely be hoped for. It is generally conceded that the Dunning Government will be returned with a large majority when they appeal to the people. There are rumours that even adherents of the Provincial Progressive Party, who during the Grain Growers' Convention in Regina had a secret session, have come to the same conclusion. An official of the Wheat Pool, who played a prominent part in the calling of the session, demanding an aggressive move, was censured by the other members of the Board, the latter having decided that the Wheat Pool should not be drawn into politics."

Here is the original article if anybody wants to see it. It is simply a statement of facts without any comment. This is the article which inspired my friend to assert in the Arm River by-election that J. J. Stevenson had made those terrible statements in *The Courier* asking electors not to vote for Dr. Anderson because he was an Orangeman. I leave it to the intelligence of honourable members of the House to point out where, in that article, there is any statement to the effect that Catholics should not vote for Dr. Anderson because he is an Orangeman. Still, my honourable friend peddles this information from one meeting to the other. He comes to this House, to this Session, and maintains he knows nothing about beating the religious and racial prejudice drum. I am content to leave the matter to the intelligence of the members of this House.

Bryant's Racial Prejudice Speeches

But, Mr. Speaker, there was another active Opposition worker in the Arm River campaign —I refer to the gentleman who enjoyed the unique distinction of being at one and the same time, vice-president of the Provincial Conservative Association and the president of the Regina Conservative Association. I am now referring to Mr. J. F. Bryant, of the City of Regina. I believe I am right in assuming that he is very prominent in the councils of the Tory party and, I think the senior member for Saskatoon and the junior member for Regina will grant I am correct in that.

Mr. MacPherson: Yes you are.

Hon. Mr. Uhrich: This gentleman not only beat the religious prejudice drum; he was a whole religious prejudice band himself. And, since he holds these responsible positions in the party, we may presume that the honourable gentleman expressed the opinions of that party particularly when he took part in the election campaign and when he went from platform to platform in that constituency. I think I am not wrong when I assume that he speaks for the Conservative Party of the Province. I find that in Davidson, on October 15th, he claimed:

"That the immigration policy of the Canadian Government was influenced by the Catholic bishops of Quebec, he alleged that in Saskatchewan religious discord had been created, the Liberals paying more attention to party success than the future progress of the country."

Later on he says:

"Protestant immigrants are apparently not wanted. Government officials raise difficulties in the way of British immigrants to Canada but immigrants from central Europe were brought in constantly increasing numbers."

Ah, that was in Davidson! But at Imperial, on October 22nd, speaking on immigration, Mr. Bryant had this to say:

"The issues in the present campaign were not made by the Liberal party but by the Church of Rome. French Catholics had expressed their readiness to work for the defence of the Roman Catholic faith which was aiming at temporal power. The Liberal party at Ottawa and the Gardiner Government of Saskatchewan have lined up with the forces of the Church of Rome."

Now, we must assume in view of the high positions he holds in the Conservative party that he was expressing the opinion of the party along those lines.

At Davidson, on October 16th, as reported by my honourable friend's Independent newspaper, another statement was made by this gentleman. He says:

"Canada wants British folk. But the Roman Catholic Church, the Province of Quebec and the Liberal party as now constituted don't want them."

"A French delegation of 30 persons, consisting of prominent Catholic bishops, priests, and politicians from Quebec, New Ontario and Saskatchewan, waited on Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, and on the French cabinet ministers, and asked for a cent a mile rate on the Canadian National Railway from Quebec to Saskatchewan and the West and that all children under 17 years of age should be carried free. The delegation presented a petition signed by 125,000 French Canadians who, they stated, represented 250,000 electors,

who wanted to come to Saskatchewan and the West. Two hundred and fifty thousand electors would represent at least a half million souls. The arrangements have been quietly made during the last four or five years and the annual excursions of priests to Saskatchewan have been in pursuance of this project.

"Within five years or ten at the most under present political conditions, Roman Catholics will be in the majority in Saskatchewan, and the French will control the political destinies of Quebec, Saskatchewan and all of Canada."

I find, again, as reported in the *Regina Daily Star* on October 19, that this gentleman spoke at Craik and with him on the platform were the Leader of the Conservative Party and the junior member for Regina (*Mr. MacPherson*). Mr. Bryant is reported as having made the following statement on that occasion:

"The natural resources of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba have been illegally withheld from the people of these provinces. Saskatchewan has been deprived of its birth-right and placed in a position of inferiority in the Dominion family by the Liberal party through the influence of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Quebec."

Now, I was more than ordinarily surprised at this remark. I did not expect that the leader of the Tory party would object to statements of that kind; but yesterday we had the spectacle of the honourable the junior member for Regina, rising in his place and absolutely repudiating what my honourable friend, the Attorney-General, said about Maloney, and telling the Attorney-General that the Tory party had nothing whatever to do with, and was in no way responsible for, expressions of individual members of the party. Now, I should have expected after reading this morning's paper, that my honourable friend surely would have got up at this meeting and insisted that Mr. Bryant stop using such expressions—at least that he not reveal in public the opinion of the great Conservative Party regarding such matters. But I find my honourable friend, though sitting on the platform, remained absolutely quiet. Nor do I find the honourable, the leader of the Conservative Party objecting to such a statement made by the President of the Regina Conservative Party and the Vice-president of the Provincial Conservative Party.

Mr. MacPherson: If I be permitted—I think I might just refer you to what I said after that. If anyone who was at the Craik meeting were here, he would remember what I said as I followed this speaker. I well remember that I made it clear that I stood by the written platform of the Conservative Party in these matters and further than that, I was not prepared to go.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I would ask the honourable gentleman now, whether the man who holds the position of President of the local Conservative Party and Vice-President of the Provincial Conservative Party was expressing the opinion of the Conservative Party regarding this matter or whether he was just talking nonsense.

Mr. MacPherson: I would say he was expressing his own opinion, and not the views of the Conservative Party.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: If that be so, I should like to know why they elected such a man (and he has since been re-elected), if the views he expresses are not the views of the Conservative Party. I should like to know why they elected this gentleman if he expresses political views which are not the views of the party!

Mr. MacPherson: He was speaking for himself.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: That's too thin. Absolutely too thin. The political taste of this gentleman reminds me of the physical appetite of a sea-gull. From place to place he goes, peddling this stuff throughout the constituency of Arm River and yet my honourable friend, the leader of the Conservative Party, gets up in his seat and says on his honour as a member of this House that no attempt was made to arouse religious prejudices in the Arm River by-election, why, then do we find the Vice-President of the Conservative Association of Saskatchewan, the President of the Conservative Association of the City of Regina, going from place to place making statements like that? I leave it to the intelligence of the members to decide why they were made.

Mr. A. G. MacKinnon's Protest

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if additional proof were necessary, I have the statement of a very prominent member of the Conservative Party in the City of Regina (and surely my friend, the leader of the Tory Party, and my friend, the junior member for Regina, will not stand up and tell me that Mr. A. G. MacKinnon, K.C., is not a prominent Conservative), the man who had the distinction of being chosen as the Conservative standard bearer in the Federal Election in 1926, in the City of Regina against the Honourable C. A. Dunning. Surely they will not say that Mr. MacKinnon is not a prominent Conservative, but will admit that he has long been an active member of that party in this City.

We will read what Mr. MacKinnon says about this religious drum that was thumped in the Arm River by-election in spite of the fact that the leader of the Conservative Party, from his seat in this House says no such attempt was ever made. Here is what A. G. MacKinnon, K.C., says in an open letter to the press:

"I wish as a Catholic Conservative to protest against the attacks made in the recent Arm River campaign against the Catholic Church by those who profess to represent the Conservative Party."

He points out, you see, that the men who made those attacks were representing the Conservative Party. The letter continues:

"There are sufficient questions of vital importance at issue between the parties in this province without having to resort to such attacks."

My honourable friend would not dare to say this man is not speaking as a Conservative—the man who was chosen Conservative standard bearer for Regina in 1926. Furthermore, I find in another letter, in reply to one which was written by Mr. F. R. McMillan, President of the Provincial Conservative Party, Mr. MacKinnon answered as follows:

"I am in receipt of your open letter of the 2nd instant in reply to mine of the 30th ultimo. It is difficult for me to understand your denial that the attacks I refer to were made. If you care to peruse the files of the daily papers published in Regina and Saskatoon during the last week of the campaign and on the day following the election in Arm River, you can find ample evidence of the matter to which I have made reference. Evils are not corrected by following the example of the ostrich and refusing to see them.

"To suggest that the statements were only the individual opinions of those who made them is pure evasion. You must be aware that I was not referring to statements made by ordinary individuals, but by men occupying high official positions in our party. They are the mouthpiece of the party and, unless and until their statements are repudiated officially, must be taken to correctly represent the attitude and views of the party. It would appear from your letter that you concur in those statements inasmuch as you, the official head of the party in this province, see nothing objectionable in them."

Now, will my honourable friend, the junior member for Regina, rise in his place in this House and say Mr. MacKinnon, K.C., was not expressing Conservative opinion in these letters? Will my friend the leader of the Tory Party do so?

Mr. MacPherson: I think that the honourable gentleman, if he reads the letter further, will find it said that he "professes to speak for the Conservative Party."

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: That's pretty thin! Mr. Bryant has been elected since, as you know. When we get such evidence from a Conservative in an open letter to the people of the Province on conditions as they exist, I think the situation becomes more and more clear.

Anderson's Declaration at Craik

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand another matter. You know, my honourable friend, the Tory leader, has a great habit of seeking the public eye. He loves publicity—as my honourable friend from Swift Current (*Mr. Sykes*) says: "It must be the Conservative platform because it has the Tory leader's picture on the front." My honourable friend loves publicity and I find here in certain newspapers scattered throughout the Dominion an account of an interview he gave after the Arm River by-election. The other day my honourable leader, the Premier, read one of these extracts and my honourable friend, the Tory leader, got up and denied it saying he was wrongly reported. Unfortunately for him, he appears always to be wrongly reported. In order to give him a further opportunity I shall just bring this to his attention. In the *Saskatoon Phoenix* of October 26th, he is quoted as saying:

"'The voice of Arm River is the voice of Saskatchewan' said Dr. J. T. M. Anderson, leader of the Conservative Party, at Craik, last night.

"'Mr. Gardiner and his cabinet here, and a large number of the members of his party addressing meetings in rural and urban centres frantically endeavoured to ward off a large Conservative majority. . . .

"'It will not escape the attention of the public that a small poll at Lakeside near Holdfast, where the majority of electors are Roman Catholics, are working hand in glove with Premier J. G. Gardiner. The Conservative Party believes in a square deal for all, but they do not believe in getting down on their knees to solicit the support of any individual or organisation whose aims do not emphasise the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian citizenship.'"

Well, that is from the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*. Evidently the gentleman is not wrongly reported on this occasion.

Mr. Anderson: You told me to keep my seat.

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: Furthermore, I find the honourable, the leader of the Tory Party, speaking at the Convention subsequently held at Davidson—where they did not elect Mr. Adrain their candidate for next election.

Mr. Anderson: That is our business!

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: I am making a statement of fact. You have no right to interrupt me. At Davidson, it is reported that Dr. Anderson "paid tribute to the fairness of the *Star-Phoenix* reports in the Arm River campaign." That was on November 16th, three weeks after he had given this famous interview to the *Star-Phoenix* on the result of the election in Arm River. Again, in the *Regina Post* of October 26, I find this: "The voice of Arm River is the voice of Saskatchewan," word for word, the same interview. I go further, and find in the *Western Producer* that the leader of the Conservative Party is reported as saying: "Mr. Gardiner and his cabinet frantically endeavoured to ward off a large Conservative majority, etc."—the same interview. And again: "The voice of Arm River is the voice of Saskatchewan." I hope it is!

Mr. Anderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: Yes, he says "Hear, hear!" Well, hear this. My honourable friend continues:

"It will not escape the attention of the public that a small poll at Lakeside, where the majority of the electors are Roman Catholic are working hand and glove with Premier J. G. Gardiner. The Conservative Party does not believe in getting down on its knees to solicit the support of any individual or organisation whose aims do not emphasise the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian citizenship."

What is the meaning of this rather remarkable statement if it is not that Roman Catholics are not loyal to the Union Jack and cannot be 100 per cent. Canadians? Well, the result of the Arm River election testifies to one thing; that the Conservatives with this line of campaign were not successful in winning a victory at the polling booths.

I turn now to *Le Patriote*, the French newspaper, published in Prince Albert, and here again we have Dr. Anderson stating that "the voice of Arm River is the voice of Saskatchewan.

The Conservative party believes in justice for all but it does not believe in begging for the support of any individual or of any organisation whose aims do not emphasise the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian citizenship."

I have another report, one from *The Prairie Messenger*:

"It will not escape the attention of the public that a small group of Roman Catholics, near Holdfast, are working hand-in-glove with Premier J. G. Gardiner. The Conservative party believe in a square deal for all, but do not believe in getting down on their knees to solicit the support of any organisation whose aims and objects do not emphasise the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian citizenship."

Then it goes on to say:

"Needless to say, the last part of the sentence is an outright slander on the Catholics of the Province. It is libel on our loyalty and patriotism to insinuate that Catholics are not as good citizens as Canadians of other religious profession. This reference to our attitude towards the Union Jack and Canadian citizenship is a piece of insolence and an insult, not only to the Catholic citizens of the Dominion, but also to the sacred memory of those brave Canadian Catholic boys who now lie dead in Flanders fields for the Union Jack and 100 per cent. Canadian citizenship not all Canadian patriotism manifests itself as Andersonian patriotism."

Mr. McConnell: Are these separate interviews?

Hon. Dr. Uhrich: No, the same interview in different newspapers.

Dr. Uhrich's Appeal for Unity and Tolerance

I claim that any brand of Canadianism that does not accord the same equality to all its citizens irrespective of creed or race or place of birth is a fraud. In 1927 we celebrated the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation.

I might bring to the attention of the House, to the attention of yourself, Mr. Speaker, that in 1867, when Confederation was made a fact, Protestant and Catholic statesmen laboured together to bring about a united nation. I might also bring to your attention the fact that Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile, with equal gallantry and courage laid down their lives upon the gory fields of that awful struggle during the last war. We saw those soldiers as they were called from farm and factory, from office and college. They did not come, Sir, as Catholics or Protestants, as Jews or Gentiles; they came as Canadian citizens.

They marched away with the same manly stride, with the same gleam of courage in their eyes, the same hot flame of patriotism in their hearts—Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant. On the gory plains of France and Flanders they fought and died together—Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant.

Amid the storm of shot and shell, through fogs of deadly gases, Catholic boys bore from the fields the torn bodies of Protestant comrades, and Protestant boys with equal fortitude gathered the helpless bodies of Catholic boys in their arms and carried them to safety.

On all these gory fields the Protestant nurse and the Catholic Sister alike ministered to the dying and cared for the wounded. Bending above the bodies of soldiers whose souls were departing was the Catholic priest with his cross; the Protestant minister with his Bible.

In camp and field, in trench and hospital, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, the Knights of Columbus and the Jewish societies laboured in co-operation to ameliorate suffering and to assuage pain.

Catholic priests and Catholic nuns, Jewish Rabbis and Jewish nurses, Protestant clergymen and Protestant nurses, together with physicians of all religions and of no religion, with equal tenderness and heroism alleviated the hardships of the field and the agonies of the hospital.

After unity of command had been established, English, Scottish, Irish and Welsh boys, boys from Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and India; boys from all parts of the Empire were placed under the command of the little grey Catholic Frenchman, Marshal Foch, who led them all and led them well. There came the day of peace. The brown columns began the return march. And mothers gathered to gaze at the gaps once filled by their gallant dead. So they stood—Jewish mothers and Gentile mothers: Catholic mothers and Protestant mothers: the same pain in their hearts: the same tears in their eyes.

There were the cheers of mighty multitudes that rose and broke like the waves of a vast ocean—cheers for the soldiers of liberty.

Their bosoms thrilled with pride that they had helped to save the sanctity of our flag, which proclaims liberty for all, equality for all, justice for all,—the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience.

If my country means anything to me, it means that its institutions are broad enough to protect every man in the right to his faith, every man in the right to his opinion, every man in his liberty of speech, in his right of peaceful assemblage.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Shortt Library of Canadians

